DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 026 558 AC 003 113

By-Alexander, Frank D.

Volunteer Study Groups; Characteristics and Educational Functions; Home Demonstration Units in Onondaga County. Extension Study No. 18.

State Univ. of New York, Ithaca. Coll. of Agriculture at Cornell.; State Univ. of New York, Ithaca. Coll. of Home Economics at Cornell Univ.

Pub Date Oct 68

Note-204p.

EDRS Price MF-$1.00 HC-$10.30

Descriptors-*Adult Leaders, *Demonstrations (Educational), Extension Agents, *Home Economics Education, Interviews, Investigations, Leadership Training, Participant Characteristics, Planning Meetings, Program Evaluation, *Rural Extension, Statistical Data, *Urban Areas

Identifiers-*New York State

The study aimed at describing the characteristics of a sample of home demonstration units in Onondaga County; testing the effectiveness of the teaching of a selected project; relating characteristics of the units to the learning of the participants; comparing characteristics of project leaders, trained teachers, and members of the unit; and indicating the leaders' preparation for teaching the project. Information was collected through interviews, pre- and posttests, and lesson reports from project leaders. Covariance of analysis was used to correlate learning and characteristics of the units as derived from personal characteristics of members, and only one of nine categories was significant at the .05 level. (Included in the appendixes are the interview schedule for unit members, floor facts test with correct answers indicated, leader's report form, tables presenting data on unit members irrespective of unit connections, and tables presenting detailed data on relationships of unit characteristics to learning of members participating in the floor facts project). (nl)

ED026558

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

VOLUNTEER STUDY GROUPS
CHARACTERISTICS AND EDUCATIONAL FUNCTIONS
Home Demonstration Units in Onondaga County

Extension Study No. 18

Office of Extension Studies
New York State Colleges of Agriculture and Home Economics
Statutory College of the State University
at Cornell University
Ithaca, New York

October, 1968

AC003113

Author: Frank D. Alexander, Extension Studies Analyst

To: Potential Readers

From: The Author

Subject: About This Report

This report finds itself in a post-mortem role. While preliminary data from the study were made available to the committee which studied the relationship of the Home Economics Division of Cooperative Extension in New York to the home demonstration units and subsequently made the recommendation that separated the official ties of the division to the units, it was impossible to prepare a completed report for the committee before its decision was made.

As an historical study, the report presents many important details about urban and suburban home demonstration units. But it need not be considered an historical document only. There are a number of important implications for small volunteer study groups which should be helpful to home economists and others interested in conducting educational work through such groups. The Home Economics Division of Cooperative Extension continues to identify organized groups as one of its primary audiences. For those counties which are predominantly urban, the study's findings and implications may be particularly relevant.

The author of the report wishes to thank the interviewers who were employed to interview the unit members. The entire group was unusually capable. Special commendation is also given Patricia Coolican, leader of the Onondaga County Home Economics Division, for recruiting the interviewers and for her excellent administration of other aspects of the data collection. Linanne Sackett, Cooperative Extension Agent in Onondaga County, did an excellent job of developing and administering a test to project leaders and through these leaders to the participants in the Floor Facts Project which was an important phase of the study. In the author's entire experience, the efficiency with which these two agents and their clerical staff managed the data collection has never been excelled.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Summary of Findings 1

Some Major Observations About the Findings for These Urban-Suburban Units 19

Introduction 25

Origin of the Study 25

Objectives of Study 26

Methodology 26

Personal Characteristics of Members by Units and for Total Membership 31

Place of Residence 31

Age of Members 33

Years of School Completed 33

Number of Home Economics Courses Taken 34

Size of Family and Household 35

Occupations of Husbands 37

Employment of Members 39

Participation of Members in Organizations 41

Status of HD Units Compared to Other Organizations . . 43

Net Family Income: 1964 44

Characteristics Derived from Relationship of Members to Units by Units and for Total Membership 46

Number of Members in Units 46

Number of Years of Membership 47

Number of Years Units Had Existed 47

Friendship Percent Score of Unit Members 48

Percent of Unit Members Who Were Close Friends 50

Percent of Unit Members Known Very Little 51

Percent of Unit Members Not Known 52

Visiting Among Unit Members 53

Number of Women Recruited for Unit Membership 54

Reasons for Belonging to Units 55

What Members Expected to Learn in Unit 59

Page

Leadership in Units. 59

Number of Different Leadership Positions Held 59

Specific Leadership Positions Held. 61

How Project Leaders Were Selected 63

Percent of Membership Years Devoted to Leadership . . 64

Difficulty in Finding Project Leaders 66

Project Teaching 68

Number of Extension and Nonextension Projects in Which Participated (1964-65) 68

Reaction of Unit Members to Project Teaching. 68

Learning Through Projects (1964-65) 73

Method of Choosing Projects 77

Program Planning Meetings. 78

Program Planning Compared to Other Meetings 78

Evaluation of Program Planning Meetings 79

Meeting Situations.. 80

Number of Times Units Met or Planned to Meet. 80

Time of Day at Which Units Met. 81

Places at Which Units Met 81

Physical and Mental State of Women at Time of Meetings. 83

Estimated Average Number of Hours Devoted to Unit Meetings 83

Estimated Average Number of Hours of Unit Meetings Devoted to Project Lessons. 84

Percent of Total Meeting Time Devoted to Project Lessons 86

Late Comers for Project Lessons 87

Sources of Homemaking Information. 89

Relationship of HD Units to College of Home Economics. . . 90

Evaluation of Teaching of the Floor Facts Project. 94

Measurement of Effects of the Project Teaching. . . . 95

Page

Relationship of Unit Characteristics to Learning of Members Participating in Floor Facts Project. 97

  Relationship of Learning to Characteristics of Unit as Derived from Personal Characteristics of Members 99

  Relationship of Learning to Characteristics of Units as Derived from Members' Connections with the Units. 100

Floor Facts Project Leaders 100

  Comparison of Floor Facts Project Leaders with Members of Units 100

  Preparation of Leaders for Teaching. 104

    Pre- and post-test scores on knowledge of Floor Facts material. 104

    Time spent in preparation 105

  Number of Hours Spent Teaching Floor Facts Project . 108

  Leaders' Evaluation of Teaching of Floor Facts Project. 108

  Coverage of Topics in Teaching the Floor Facts Project. 109

  Use of Teaching Aids for the Floor Facts Project . . 109

Supplement--Variations Around Central Tendencies. 111

Appendix A: Interview Schedules for Unit Members 121

Appendix B: Floor Facts Test with Correct Answers Indicated. 139

Appendix C: Leaders' Report Form 143

Appendix D: Tables Presenting Data on Unit Members Irrespective of Unit Connections. 147

Appendix E: Tables Presenting Detailed Data on Relationship of Unit Characteristics to Learning of Members Participating in Floor Facts Project 177

VOLUNTEER STUDY GROUPS
CHARACTERISTICS AND EDUCATIONAL FUNCTIONS
Home Demonstration Units in Onondaga County

Summary of Findings[1]

I. Objectives of Study

A. To describe the characteristics of a sample of HD units in Onondaga County.

B. To test the effectiveness of the teaching of a selected project, i.e., Floor Facts, to members of these units by project leaders.

C. To relate the characteristics of the units to the learning of the members who were taught the project.

D. To compare for selected characteristics the project leaders who taught the project, those who were trained to teach it, and members of the units.

E. To indicate the leaders' preparation for teaching the project along with their teaching input and evaluation of the teaching.

II. Major Sources of Data for the Study

A. Interview schedules obtained from 1021 members in 62 units which had indicated intent to participate in the Floor Facts Project.

B. Usable pre- and post-tests from the same individual on the Floor Facts Project obtained from 362 members in 48 units.

---

[1] The critical reader may find it helpful to read first the supplementary section on variations around central tendencies, pages 111 to 120.

C. Usable pre- and post-tests from the same individual on the Floor Facts Project obtained from 57 project leaders.

D. Lesson reports obtained for 54 units from 53 project leaders.

III. Personal Characteristics of Members by Units[1] and for Total Membership

A. Place of residence

1. The units were predominantly urban with 59 percent having from 70 to 100 percent of their members living in urban places.
2. The largest percent (26) of the members as a whole (N=1019) lived near a village of 2,500 and over in a built-up suburban area.

B. Age of members

1. The median age in the average unit was 37.4 years.[2]
2. 71 percent of the units had median ages which were under 40.
3. Less than one third of the members (N=1019) of the 62 units were 40 years of age and over.

C. Years of school completed

1. The members of the average unit had a median of 12.9 years of school completed.
2. 38 percent of the units had medians for number of years of school completed of 13.0 or more.
3. 49 percent of the members (N=1016) had one or more years of school beyond high school.

---

[1] The number of units for which data on these characteristics were available was 62.

[2] Average and mean are used throughout the study interchangeably. Median, which is also an average in the generic sense, is always used directly and never designated as an average.

D. Number of home economics courses taken exclusive of HD projects

1. The average unit had a mean of 2.4 courses in home economics (exclusive of HD projects) taken by its members.
2. Only two units, or three percent, had from 5.1 - 6.0 averages.
3. 81 percent of the 1021 members had taken 3.0 or less courses.

E. Size of family and household

1. In the average unit, the mean size of members' families was 4.1.
2. One fifth of the 1021 members had families with from six to nine members, and a little over one fourth (28 percent) had families with from one to three members.
3. In the average unit, the mean size of members' households was 4.3.
4. 43 percent of 1020 members had households consisting of five or more members.

F. Occupations of husbands

1. Over half (58 percent) of the units had professional, technical and kindred workers as the first ranking (in percent) occupational class of husbands of members. The second ranking occupational class represented by the husbands was craftsmen, foremen and kindred workers.
2. Of the 972 members (irrespective of units) who had husbands, 351, or 36 percent, had husbands in the occupational class of professional, technical and kindred workers. Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers was the second ranking occupational class with 17 percent.

3. When both units and total membership are considered, the women who were members of the 62 units were primarily from the upper occupational classes.

G. Employment of members

1. The average unit had 31.3 percent of its members employed by self or someone full- or part-time or some combination thereof.
2. 26 percent of the units had from 40 - 49 percent of their members employed by self or someone full- or part-time.
3. If all of the 1021 members are considered, 32 percent were employed either part- or full-time by someone and/or by self.

H. Participation of members in organizations

1. In the average unit, the mean participation score was 7.9.[1]
2. In the average unit, the mean number of organizations to which members belonged was 4.0.
3. 84 percent of the units had mean participation scores in the class of 5.0 - 9.9.
4. Of the 1021 members, 51 percent had participation scores under 7.0. 25 percent had scores above 11.0.
5. 42 percent of the 1021 members belonged to from one to three organizations.
6. The two organizations to which the largest number of the women belonged were: church or synagogue, 929; and PTA, 397.

I. Status of HD units compared to other organizations

1. In the average unit, the precent of women rating their units high or very high was 63.1.

---

[1] Participation score equals sum of organizations to which one belongs plus three times the number of official positions held.

2. Of 14 organizations to which 29 or more women belonged, the HD unit ranked tenth from the top on status score.
3. While the members appeared to rate their units fairly high, compared to their ratings of other organizations the unit did not have a relatively high standing.

J. Net family income: 1964
   1. The units were composed predominantly of members in the middle income class of \$5,000 - \$9,999.
   2. The median net income for 983 on whom information was obtained was \$8,119.

IV. Characteristics[1] Derived from Relationship of Members to Units by Units' and for Total Membership

A. Number of members in units
   1. The average unit had a mean membership of approximately 18 women.
   2. Very few of the units had large memberships; three had from 26 - 30; three from 31 - 35; and one had 36.

B. Number of years of membership
   1. The average unit had a mean number of years of membership of 4.5.
   2. 18 percent, or 11, of the units were new groups.
   3. Only five units had an average (mean) number of membership years of 10.0 or more.
   4. Slightly over two thirds (68 percent) of the 1019 members reporting had been members of their unit for less than five years.

---

[1] The number of units for which data on these characteristics were available was 62.

C. Number of years units had existed

1. The average unit had been in existence for 9.4 years. The range was from 0 to 40 years.
2. 69 percent of the units had been in existence for 10 years or less. Only 11 percent had existed 20 years or more.

D. Friendship percent score of unit members[1]

1. The average unit had a mean percent score of 58.2. The range in percentage points of the scores of members within units was often fairly large.
2. Of the 1020 members who provided information, 51 percent had friendship scores under 60 percent.
3. Only a small percent (seven) of the 1020 members had scores of 80 percent or more, and only nine percent had scores that were under 30.

E. Percent of unit members who were close friends

1. The mean percent of members who were claimed by other members as close friends in the average unit was 22.1.
2. Of the 1020 who gave information, 59.7 percent claimed close friendship with less than 20 percent of their unit members.
3. Only 7.7 percent of the 1020 claimed close friendship with 50 percent or more of their unit's members.

---

[1] Each unit member who was interviewed was presented with a list of all of the members of her unit and asked to indicate the degree of her friendship with each by checking one of four choices, i.e., one of the closest, an average acquaintance, know very little, and do not know. Numerical values--3, 2, 1, 0--were assigned to these respective choices. Each respondent's score was then summed and a percentage score based on the number of members minus one (the respondent) calculated.

F. Percent of unit members known very little

1. The mean percent of members known very little by the different members of the average unit was 23.1.
2. Of the 1020 members giving information, 18 percent knew very little from 40 - 100 percent of the members of their units.

G. Percent of unit members not known

1. The mean percent of unit members who were not known by other members of the average unit was 12.0.
2. About three fourths (76 percent) of the units had mean percentages which were under 20.0.
3. Of the 1020 women on whom information was obtained, 44 percent indicated there was no one in their unit whom they did not know.

H. Visiting among unit members

1. The members of the average unit had a mean of 24.7 percent of other members whom they had visited one or more times in the past three months. In only a few of the units was there any extensive amount of visiting among members.
2. Of the 1020 members who reported on their visiting other members, almost three fourths (73 percent) had visited less than 30 percent of the other members in the past three months.

I. Number of women recruited for unit membership

1. 57 percent of the 784 members reporting (234 did not consider themselves eligible to answer) had recruited one or more members.

J. Reasons for belonging to units

1. On a list of nine, the reasons most frequently checked by the 1021 members were: a) *because I want to learn more about the best ways to run my household* (94 percent) and b) *because I enjoy (or expect to enjoy) the social life which the unit provides* (82 percent).
2. In no unit was the percent of members below 64 who chose *because I want to learn more about the best ways to run my household*, and 40 percent of the units had 100 percent.
3. Twenty-nine percent of the units had 90 - 100 percent of members choosing *because I enjoy (or expect to enjoy) the social life which the unit provides*.

K. What members expected to learn in unit

1. The most frequently stated learning expectation (271, or 27 percent, of 988 respondents) was *improve homemaking skills and/or keep up-to-date on new ideas and techniques*. This expectation was followed closely by *gain more knowledge--new ideas, better methods--more about whatever is taught* (242, or 24 percent, of 988 respondents).

V. Leadership in Units[1]

A. Number of different leadership positions held

1. The average unit had a mean of different leadership positions ever held by its members of 1.9.
2. The average unit had 36 percent of its members (new members included) who had never held a leadership position.

---

[1] The number of units for which leadership data were available was 62.

3. Slightly over one tenth of the 1021 women had held from five to nine different positions since joining their units, whereas slightly over one third of them had held only one or two positions.

B. Specific leadership positions held

1. A little over one third of the members who had held one or more leadership positions (649) had served as chairman; an equal proportion had been vice-chairman; and a like proportion secretary. One fourth had been treasurer.
2. Two fifths of those who had held one or more leadership positions (of 649) had been leader for one project; only seven percent (of 646) had been leader for four projects.

C. How project leaders were selected, as reported by unit chairmen

1. Over one half (51 percent) of the units selected their leaders by having them volunteer.
2. Another 37 percent of the units combined volunteering and the chairman asking women to be leaders.

D. Percent of membership years devoted to leadership

1. The average unit had a mean of 59.8 percent of membership years devoted to leadership.
2. In 58 percent of the 62 units, the mean percent of membership years devoted to leadership was 50 or more.
3. Twenty-nine and one tenth percent of the 1019 members for whom a percent could be calculated, had devoted from 100 to 250+ percent of their membership years to leadership; this means these women were holding from 1 to 2.5+ leadership positions per year.

E. Difficulty in finding project leaders

1. For the average unit, the percent of members who thought it was difficult to find project leaders was 35.6.
2. Of the 874 members answering the question as to the difficulty of finding project leaders, 64 percent did not think there was any difficulty.
3. The most frequently mentioned reason given by 287 who thought it difficult to find project leaders was small children--babysitting problem.

VI. Project Teaching[1]

A. Number of extension and nonextension projects in which participated (1964-65)

1. The average unit organized long enough to have had some project teaching (N=50), had a mean of 4.95 extension projects in which its members participated in 1964-65.
2. Of the 707 members who gave information, 249, or 35 percent, had participated in three or less extension projects in 1964-65.
3. About half (51 percent) of the 707 members had participated in from one to three nonextension projects in 1964-65.

B. Reactions of unit members to project teaching

1. The average unit organized long enough to have had some project teaching (N=57), had a mean score of 3.7 for its members' ratings of project teaching.[2]

---

[1] The number of units on which project teaching data were available varies, so the N is indicated throughout.

[2] The range of possible scores was from +5 to -5. A score was the sum of either positive, negative or neutral ratings of length of discussion, amount of discussion, project leader's training, subject matter--general vs. concrete, and attention given.

2. Of 852 members who rated project teaching, only 5.1 percent gave a negative rating. Over half of them (50.6 percent) gave the project teaching the highest possible rating, +5.

C. Learning through projects (1964-65)

1. In the average unit (N=51), 86 percent of the members indicated that they had learned something which they had applied from the first or only 1964-65 project listed as liked best.
2. The projects which were listed first and most frequently out of two or three (or the only one) liked best, were Interior Design, Versatile Egg, and Stitch Those Knits.
3. Most of the projects listed first (or the only one listed) as liked best had large percentages of unit members who had learned something which was applied.

D. Method of choosing projects

1. Of 847 members (exclusive of new members) who gave information, 82 percent thought each member checked her preferences for program topics on a list of projects developed by a county program committee and Cornell University, with those topics receiving the largest number of choices being included in the unit's program.
2. When the chairmen of the units were asked with an open-end question to indicate the procedure by which their units selected projects for the program year, 45 percent of 60 chairmen reporting stated that projects offered by Extension were explained, members checked preferences on lists, and projects with the greatest number of choices were included in the program. Almost as many chairmen (42 percent) included as modifications of this major procedure a combination

of it with the choice of other projects not offered by Extension and also decided by vote or with attempting to find a project leader.

VII. Program Planning Meetings[1]

A. Program planning compared to other meetings

1. Of 58 unit chairmen giving general estimates, almost half (48 percent) thought over 75 percent of the members attended both program planning and other meetings; another 21 percent thought there was generally no difference, but estimated attendance at both meetings between 50 and 75 percent.

B. Evaluation of program planning meetings

1. In the average unit (excluding three new ones) (N=59), the percent of women who thought the meetings useful was 88.9.

VIII. Meeting Situations[2]

A. Number of times units met or expected to meet

1. The 49 units reporting and in existence during the year or part of a year before the members were interviewed, met on the average of 18 times. The range was from one to 52 times.
2. During the year 1965-66, the average unit (N=62) expected to meet about 18 times.

B. Time of day at which units met

1. Eighty-nine percent of the 62 units held their meetings in the evening.

---

[1] The number of units on which data for program planning meetings were available varies so N is indicated throughout.

[2] The number of units on which data for meeting situations were available varies so N is indicated throughout.

C. Places at which units met

1. About three fourths of the 62 units held their meetings in the houses of the members.
2. About one third of the 47 units which met in members' homes had problems of space, seating capacity, or distance to travel in winter.

D. Physical and mental state of women at time of meetings

1. In general, the women who reported on their physical and mental state at the time of meetings rated themselves either average or above average.

E. Estimated average number of hours devoted to unit meetings

1. The mean for the estimated average length of meetings for 61 units reporting was 3.0 hours.

F. Estimated average number of hours of unit meetings devoted to project lessons

1. The mean for the estimated average length of project meeting for 60 units reporting was 2.1 hours.

G. Percent of total meeting time devoted to project lessons

1. The mean percent of total meeting time devoted to project lessons for 59 units reporting was 67.2.

H. Late comers for project lessons

1. The mean estimated percent of late comers for 60 units reporting was 9.5.

IX. Sources of Homemaking Information

A. Of four extension sources of homemaking information, for the 62 units the home demonstration unit had by far the highest average (mean) percent (57.8) of members making much use of it.

B. When members irrespective of units are considered, the upper three sources of homemaking information, on the basis of percentages making much use of, were home demonstration unit, 58 percent; newspaper articles, 56 percent; and magazine articles, 54 percent. The small percent (about four) of members reporting much use of TV is noteworthy.

X. Relationship of HD Units to College of Home Economics

A. The average unit (N=62) had a mean score for its members on relationship to the College of Home Economics of 6.6 which was 73 percent of the maximum possible score of nine.[1]

B. When individual members are considered, 23 percent had perfect scores of nine, and only 27 percent had scores of five or less.

XI. Evaluation of Teaching of Floor Facts Project

A. The average unit of the 46 which had usable test data had a mean pre-test score of 10.9 points out of a maximum possible score of 21.0. The actual range of mean scores for the 46 units was 6.0 to 14.0.

B. Slightly over three fourths (76.3 percent) of the 413 members from whom usable pre- and post-tests from the same person were obtained scored from seven to 14 points on the pre-test.

C. The average unit, of the 46 which had usable test data, had a mean post-test score of 16.0 out of a maximum possible score of 21.0. The actual range was from 13.0 to 19.5.

---

[1] Scores were based on three levels of agreement plus don't know for the following statements: 1) It is necessary for the college to take leadership in working with the county to determine subject matter offered; 2) It is desirable for the college to set standards for what is taught; and 3) The college through the training given the home demonstration agents provides good training for our project leaders.

D. Slightly over one third (34.0 percent) of the individual members (413) had scores from 18 to 21 on the post-test.

E. The average unit of the 46 which had usable test data had a mean difference between the means of the pre- and post-test scores of 5.1, which was a significant gain at .0005 (one-tail) level. The unit mean gains (there were no unit mean losses) ranged from 2.0 to 8.8.

F. Of the individual members (413) 91.5 percent showed gains from the pre- to post-test. As high as 12.8 percent had gains of 10 to 18 percent.

XII. Relationship of Unit Characteristics to Learning of Members Participating in Floor Facts Project

A. Relationship of learning to characteristics of units as derived from personal characteristics of members

1. Of nine characteristics, such as place of residence, age, years of school completed, etc., only one unit characteristic was significantly related to learning of members, i.e., mean participation score, with the units having low mean participation scores having a larger mean gain in their test scores than units with high mean participation scores.

B. Relationship of learning to characteristics of units as derived from members' connections with the units

1. Of 11 characteristics, such as number of members in units, number of years unit has existed, number of years of membership of members, etc., none was significantly related to the learning of unit members.

XIII. Floor Facts Project Leaders[1]

A. Comparison of Floor Facts Project leaders with members of units on six selected characteristics

1. The Floor Facts Project leaders who actually taught the project (43) differed significantly (with higher mean scores) from the unit members (966) for organizational participation scores, friendship percent scores, and number of home economics courses taken other than those through Extension.
2. The Floor Facts Project leaders who actually taught the project (43) did not differ significantly from the 966 members on number of years of membership in their unit.
3. While the significance of differences could not be calculated, the median ages and median years of school completed were fairly similar.

B. Preparation of leaders for teaching Floor Facts Project

1. Pre- and post-test scores on knowledge of Floor Facts material
    a. On the pre-test, the 45 leaders who actually taught the Floor Facts Project and whose units returned usable pre- and post-tests from the same members, were not significantly different from the 413 unit members who took the test; nor were these leaders significantly different from the 413 members on the post-test. Although both groups made significant gains from the pre- to post-test, the difference between their gains was not significant.

---

[1] In this section of the report the number of project leaders varies according to the kinds of information being considered and in each instance is related to the absence of certain data.

2. Time spent in preparation
    a. Three tenths of 46 leaders spent only an hour or less in preparation, but seven tenths spent two or more hours.
    b. There was no significant relationship between the amount of time spent by the leader on preparation and the learning of the members taught.

C. Number of hours spent teaching Floor Facts Project
    1. Almost two thirds (62 percent) of 46 leaders spent 1.5 or more hours teaching the project.
    2. There was no significant relationship between the number of hours spent in teaching the project and the learning of the members taught.

D. Leaders' evaluation of teaching of Floor Facts Project
    1. Of the 47 leaders who reported, 72 percent were satisfied with their teaching experiences and 28 percent partially satisfied.
    2. There was no significant relationship between degree of satisfaction of the leaders and the learning of the members.

E. Coverage of topics in teaching the Floor Facts Project
    1. 45 percent of the 47 leaders who reported, indicated that they covered all eight of the major topics included in the Floor Facts Project.

F. Use of teaching aids for the Floor Facts Project
    1. Most of the 47 leaders who reported made use of the four major teaching aids that were made available to them or called to their attention in their training.

XIV. Supplement--Variations Around Central Tendencies

A. Since throughout the study means or medians were used to describe units, a supplement was added at the end in which, on the basis of coefficients of variation, the following 19 variables were considered to be adequately indexed by the means or medians used:[1]

1. Years of age
2. Years of school completed
3. Number in family
4. Number in household
5. Rating unit high or very high
6. Number of members in unit
7. Friendship percent score
8. Motive for belonging to unit--wanting to learn
9. Motive for belonging to unit--wanting to enjoy social life
10. Score on reaction to project teaching
11. Percent of unit members learned something applied
12. Percent of unit members who thought planning meetings useful
13. Number of hours unit devoted to meetings
14. Number of hours unit devoted to project lessons
15. Percent of total meeting time of unit devoted to project lessons
16. Percent of unit members making use of HD unit for information
17. Score on relationship to College of Home Economics
18. Pre-test score on Floor Facts lesson
19. Post-test score on Floor Facts lesson

---

[1] Although not customarily done, coefficients of variation using Q were also calculated for medians in order to give some idea of the variations around these measures of central tendency.

Some Major Observations About The Findings for These Urban-Suburban Units

1. The units were predominantly composed of young women, a group that the Home Economics Division considers an important audience.
2. The educational level of the various units was fairly high which means that the content of the subject matter, while directed to interests and needs, could be advanced to a fairly high level.
3. While the members of the units nad had some courses in home economics, the extent of this background of training was hardly great enough to be considered as a foundation on which to build.
4. The women in the various units had husbands who were predominantly from two classes, i.e., professional, technical, and kindred workers and craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers. Women whose husbands are from these occupational classes may be expected to want to know how to manage their homes more efficiently, and hence to be more responsive to efforts to assist them.
5. The units had a goodly number of employed members for whom certain kinds of home economics projects should be very meaningful, but for whom accommodations for time of meeting must be made.
6. While the units were composed of women who participated in several formal organizations, this participation for at least half of them was not excessive and should not have been too serious an obstacle to their participation in the unit as a study group.
7. While the unit members generally rated their units fairly high, they did not rank them high compared to other organizations to which they belonged, so that giving time and energy to unit affairs would probably be considered less important than it would be for other organizations.

8. The various units, as the occupations of husbands would indicate, had members whose incomes were middle-class incomes. In a society where pressure on the consumer to buy is great, these women could be expected to have a high interest in practical home economics information.
9. Most of the units were not excessively large and hence offered an opportunity for conducting effective study groups.
10. In general, the years of membership in units were not excessive, so that for many women exposure to home economics subject matter is not necessarily repetitive.
11. In general, units had been in existence for a decade and this could mean that some of them might have developed into social cliques with members having crystallized points-of-view about educational matters.
12. On the other hand, contrasted with 11, the friendship percent scores, extent of acquaintance of members, and amount of visiting among members indicated a lack of cliquishness or group solidarity that would be obstructive to the participation of newcomers.
13. The interest of members in recruitment of new members was prevalent in all groups to a considerable extent, indicating that in many of the units the members had a real interest in maintaining the group.
14. The dual motivations of learning useful home economics knowledge and skills and of socializing with other women were present in the units, and both motives seem to be justifiable for adult educational groups.
15. As in most organizations, leadership in the units tended to fall to a limited number of members, so that the unit could hardly claim it provided any unusual opportunity for developing leadership.

16. In all units there were those who thought it difficult to find women who would teach projects; however, this number was not especially large, usually around one third of the members of a unit.
17. The care of small children was the number one obstacle to securing project leaders. For groups of young mothers, this is undoubtedly a major problem, but it was evidently being dealt with to some extent in the units studied.
18. The members of units generally rated their project teaching fairly high and claimed they were learning things which they could apply.
19. The average unit had about five different projects in a given year, which should have given the members a fairly wide range of home economics subject matter.
20. Most units selected their projects by majority vote from a list submitted by the county and college staffs. This system appeared to take care of interests and at the same time provide subject matter which the county and college staffs were qualified to provide.
21. Unit members generally considered program-planning meetings as important as other meetings, a fact which indicated that they felt they had some voice in deciding on their study projects.
22. In general, the units had about 18 meetings per year. This number of meetings, with about five projects for the year, would appear to have provided a fairly good opportunity for learning home economics information.
23. Most of the units held their meetings in the evening, which accommodated women who were employed, of whom there were a number in most units.
24. While most units met in homes, some of these homes presented problems of space, seating capacity, and distance to travel.

25. Although evening meetings predominated, the members of the units gave little indication of being below par in energy or mental alertness.
26. The units seemed to divide their meeting time reasonably well in terms of what the women expected, with about two thirds of the time being devoted to project teaching and one third to socializing.
27. In general, the units had a relatively small number of late comers at meetings. This suggests that the problem of starting a lesson which might be interrupted by late comers was not great.
28. While recognizing that the interviewing of the members was focused on the unit, and that this may have given undue emphasis to the unit, the importance of this channel as a source of homemaking information for the members stood out. TV homemaking programs were in a relatively unimportant position.
29. On the whole, the members of the units placed fairly high value on their relationship to the College of Home Economics. They questioned most the college's setting standards for what was taught.
30. In general, unit members knew about half of the information on Floor Facts included in the pre-test. This suggests that more attention should be given to the entry level for the subject matter that is taught.
31. All units made gains in their average scores from the pre- to post-test. The average gains for the units as a whole were significant. Thus, the indication is that the units served as an effective means of transmitting information.
32. Twenty characteristics of the units were indexed by numbers, means, or percentages and these indices were related to the gain in scores between the pre- and post-tests on the Floor Facts Project. Of the 20, only one relationship was found to be significant, namely, that with participation score, for which the women with low participation scores had gains

significantly higher than those with high scores. This exploration was basically negative in that the characteristics of the units used for analysis did not appear to be important as factors affecting learning. This may mean that the character of a study group as determined by the characteristics of its members, whether personal or attributable to the unit, is basically unimportant and that other factors not studied, such as ability, motivation, etc. of individual members, influence learning more than the more obvious ones investigated.

33. The leaders who actually taught the Floor Facts Project did not perform significantly better on their pre- and post-tests and, consequently, their gains from the pre- to post-test were not significantly better than those of the members whom they taught. This tends to suggest that on the basis of testing, the leaders had succeeded in passing on what they had learned rather effectively.

34. While there were differences among the leaders who taught the Floor Facts Project in preparation time, number of teaching hours, and satisfaction with their teaching, there was no significant difference in the gains of members as a result of these variations. This analysis leaves one puzzled as to why differences for such factors would not have resulted in differential gains in learning. Perhaps the lack of significant relationship is the result of the lack of accuracy in the leaders' estimates of time and satisfaction plus the limitation of using tests from only one lesson.

35. While in this study the analysis of home demonstration units depended largely on the use of measures of central tendency, it must be recognized that the variation within units and among units is considerable for some variables and hence raises questions concerning the use of the unit as an educational device. On the other hand, a fairly large number

of the measures of central tendency when evaluated by coefficients of variation can be considered to be adequate indices of the units.

VOLUNTEER STUDY GROUPS
CHARACTERISTICS AND EDUCATIONAL FUNCTIONS
Home Demonstration Units in Onondaga County

Introduction

Origin of the Study

Interest in a study of the home demonstration unit as a volunteer study group in New York State began in 1960 when Vera Caulum, State Leader for Home Demonstration, as chairman of the Educational Policy Committee in the College of Home Economics asked the committee to consider such a study. While the committee did not endorse the idea, interest in a study continued. The Office of Extension Studies incorporated in its 1962-63 plan of work a preliminary study of home demonstration units using a sample of counties and data from a specially designed membership card. The study subsequently appeared as a report entitled, Study of Home Demonstration Units in a Sample of 27 Counties in New York State, Extension Study No. 3. The study was somewhat limited in depth, but raised a number of questions with which a subsequent study of greater depth might be concerned.

Accordingly, in its 1964-65 plan of work, the Office of Extension Studies indicated that a study in depth of the characteristics of home demonstration units and their functions as educational channels would be conducted. The study continued to be a part of the office's plan of work in 1965-66 and 1966-67 during which time preliminary investigation related to home demonstration units was conducted with selected agents; the design of the study was finalized; interviewing and testing of unit members, as called for in the design, were carried out; and the data thus obtained, organized and analyzed. Because of more pressing assignments of the Office of Extension Studies together with the severance of formal relationships between the Home Economics Division and the units, the completion of the study was delayed until 1968. However, preliminary data from the study was provided the Home Economics committee that developed the policy for severing formal relationships with units.

Objectives of Study

The study undertakes 1) to describe the characteristics of a sample of home demonstration units in Onondaga County; 2) to test the effectiveness of the teaching of a selected project to members of these units by project leaders; 3) to relate characteristics of the units to the learning of the members who were taught the project; 4) to compare on selected characteristics the project leaders who taught the project, those who were trained to teach it, and the members of the units; and 5) to indicate the leaders' preparation for teaching the project along with their teaching input and evaluation of the teaching.

Methodology

The study began with an exploration of the operations of the HD unit in six widely different counties in New York State. A schedule was developed with which the supervising county home economics agent was interviewed. The information thus obtained was subsequently used in constructing the schedule used for interviewing unit members. The information obtained by means of the latter schedule was expected to provide the principal data for characterizing the units.

The study was designed to examine the characteristics of HD units in depth rather than to study a random sample of units on a limited number of characteristics. Furthermore, the testing aspect of the study required the selection of units in one county in order to be manageable. Accordingly, a county was sought which would have a fairly large number of units taking one project and which, in addition, would have a staff that was willing to devote time to the operations of the research.

Onondaga County was selected because it met these requirements. Of its 100 units organized for the year 1965-66, 62 indicated intent to participate in a project entitled, Floor Facts. An extension professor in the Department of Household Economics and Management of the College of Home Economics, in whose field the Floor Facts Project had been developed, agreed to assist with the preparation of an evaluation test.

Considerable attention was given to the construction of the schedule for interviewing the members of the units which were expected to participate in the Floor Facts Project. As previously noted, the information obtained from interviews of six home demonstration agents was used in the construction. Suggestions for items or questions to be included were also made by Extension Leader, Bettie Lee Yerka, who was serving as liaison for the state office of the Home Economics Division to the Office of Extension Studies, and by the Onondaga County Home Economics Division Leader, Patricia M. Coolican. Other suggestions were derived from Chapter 8, "Face-to-Face Relations, In Small Groups" of Human Behavior--An Inventory of Scientific Findings by Berelson and Steiner. The schedule was pre-tested on four members of a unit which was not participating in the Floor Facts Project. (See Appendix A for schedule.)

The home economics agent responsible for training the project leaders who were expected to teach the lesson on Floor Facts developed the test which was used for pre- and post-testing the project leaders and the members of the units which had agreed to participate in the project. The test was reviewed by the extension professor in the Department of Household Economics and Management and by the author. (See Appendix B for test.)

A leader's report form for reporting time used in teaching the lesson on Floor Facts, teaching aids used, topics covered, etc., was prepared by the Onondaga County home economics agent responsible for the project. (See Appendix C.)

The Home Economics Division Leader recruited the thirteen women who interviewed the members of the 62 units. All of these women proved to be excellent interviewers. They were exposed to two training sessions. In addition, each of them met with an experienced research technician for the review of their first two or three completed schedules.

The Onondaga County home economics agent responsible for the project administered the pre- and post-tests to the project leaders, using the occasion for training them for the administration of the test to the members of their units who were expected to participate in the Floor Facts Project. This agent also collected the pre- and post-tests from the units as well as the project leaders' reports.

The 62 units that were finally identified as participants in the Floor Facts Project had 1,107 members when the interviewing for the study was initiated. Of these 1,107 members 1,021, or 92 percent, were interviewed.

Usable pre- and post-tests from the same individuals were obtained from 48 of the 62 units for a total of 362 members, or 34 percent of the total number of members (1,050) exclusive of the 57 project leaders. In addition, usable pre- and post-tests from the same individuals were obtained from 57 project leaders when they were trained by the Onondaga County home economics agent. Forty-seven of these 57 project leaders taught the 48 units from which usable pre- and post-tests of the same participating members were obtained.[1] However, in those places in the report where the unit averages for the test data are related to the characteristics of units, only 46 units are used. One unit was excluded because usable pre- and post-tests were obtained from only two members; the other, because only two members with usable pre- and post-tests had provided information on their characteristics through interview schedules.

---

[1] One project leader taught the Floor Facts lesson to two of the 48 units.

Fifty-four lesson reports were obtained from 53 different leaders. Data from 47 of these reports were used in the study.[1] These reports were collected by the Onondaga County home economics agent who was responsible for the Floor Facts Project.

The interviewing of the unit members was done from the first of November, 1965 to the end of March, 1966. Most of the interview schedules were sent in by the end of January. The training and pre- and post-testing of the project leaders was accomplished February 8, 9, 15, and 16, 1966. The project leaders did their teaching during the period from February to May, 1966.

In summary, the major sources of the data for the study were:

1. Interview schedules obtained from 1,021 members in 62 units which had indicated intent to participate in the Floor Facts Project
2. Usable pre- and post-tests from the same individual on the Floor Facts Project obtained from 362 members in 48 units
3. Usable pre- and post-tests from the same individual on the Floor Facts Project obtained from 57 project leaders
4. Lesson reports obtained for 54 units from 53 project leaders

Since a major concern which served to initiate the study was what are the effects of the characteristics of the units on their educational function, this question was embodied in the hypothesis that the educational function of a home demonstration unit will be influenced by the unit's characteristics, some 41 of which were originally listed as independent variables.

---

[1] One project leader taught two units and made separate lesson reports on each.

Although the 41 independent variables originally listed served as a guide for data collection, the data obtained relative to some of the variables could not be effectively related to the test scores of those who participated in the Floor Facts Project or did not appear to provide useful analysis. The independent variables which were finally chosen for association with the learning of unit members as revealed by knowledge test results were:

Percent of members living in rural places
Age of members
Years of school completed by members
Number of courses taken in home economics by members
Number in family of members
Percent of unit members whose husbands were in professional, technical and kindred types of occupations
Percent of unit members employed
Participation score of members
Net income of members
Number of members in unit
Number of years unit had existed
Number of years of membership of members
Number of leadership positions held by members
Percent of membership years devoted to leadership
Percent of average meeting time spent on project lessons
Reaction of members to project teaching
Friendship percent score among members
Close friendship of members
Percent of members visited one or more times by each member
Relationship score of members to College of Home Economics

In the pages that follow, the discussion of the data focuses on the HD units. Although many of the sections begin with comments about tables in which the data deal with units, usually some discussion, often without tables, of the same type of data for all unit members irrespective of unit connections follows. In some instances only data for members without reference to units are presented and discussed. Considerable tabular data not included in the text for all unit members irrespective of units are presented in Appendix D. It should also be pointed out that while for purposes of emphasis in analysis the unit is the focus of the study, the arithmetic value of variables expressed in terms of a mean or mean of means (mean of the average unit) is approximately the same as the mean for the total membership irrespective of units.

At the end of the main text is a supplementary section in which a discussion of the variation around means (or medians) is presented. This supplement was prepared to inform the reader that averages can often be misleading and should be interpreted with some notion of the variations of individual values above and below them. The supplementary section was considered especially appropriate in view of the author's emphasis on the variability of characteristics of unit members in a previous study entitled, Study of Home Demonstration Units in a Sample of 27 Counties in New York State, Extension Study No. 3. Since the supplementary section is brief and essentially descriptive, perhaps the preparation of another report analyzing in detail the meaning of the variations around averages used to characterize units and describe the activities associated with them is needed.

Personal Characteristics of Members by Units and for Total Membership

Place of Residence

The predominantly urban character of the 62 units studied is reflected in the large percent (59) of them which had from 70 to 100 percent of their members who were living in urban places (Table 1).[1] Forty percent of the units had 100 percent of their members living in urban places. Only seven percent of the units had a marked mixture of urban and rural women, that is from 40 to 59 percent urban or vice versa. Moreover, only 16 percent of the units had all of their members living in rural places.

Table 1

Number and Percentage Distribution of Units According to Percent of Unit Members Living in Urban Places and Percent Living in Rural Places

	Urban		Rural	
Percent of unit members	Number of units	Percent of units	Number of units	Percent of units
None	10	16	25	40
1 - 9	4	7	6	10
10 - 19	3	5	4	7
20 - 29	0	0	2	3
30 - 39	2	3	2	3
40 - 49	3	5	1	2
50 - 59	1	2	3	5
60 - 69	2	3	2	3
70 - 79	2	3	0	0
80 - 89	3	5	2	3
90 - 99	7	11	5	8
100	25	40	10	16
Total	62	100	62	100

---

[1] Urban places included the City of Syracuse, near the City of Syracuse in a built-up suburban area, in a village of 2,500 - 9,999 and near a village of 2,500 and over in a built-up suburban area. Rural places included on a farm from which half or more of income was derived, on a farm from which less than half of income was derived, in the open country not on a farm, in a village of less than 2,500 and near a village of under 2,500 in a built-up area.

When individual members are considered, the largest percent (26) lived near a village of 2,500 and over in a built-up suburban area, and the next largest percent (18) lived in the City of Syracuse. Both types of places were considered to be urban.[1]

Age of Members

The median age of members in the average unit was 37.4 years (Table 2). Forty-two percent of the 62 units had medians for ages of members which were under 35, and 71 percent had medians under 40. Thus, the membership of a good majority of the 62 units consisted of relatively young women. This is not to say that there were no older women in many of the units. There were, but not in any large numbers. Actually, less than one third (31.9 percent) of the members (1,019) in the 62 units were over 39 years of age.

Years of School Completed

The members of the average unit had a median of 12.9 years of school completed (Table 3). For 38 percent of the 62 units the median number of years of school completed was 13.0 or more. Only eight units, or 13 percent of the total, had medians that were 11.0 years or less. On the other hand, only one unit had a median in the class interval of 16.0 to 16.9.

Of the 1,016 members in the 62 units who reported on years of schooling, 21, or two percent, had eight years or less; 429, or 42 percent, had completed 12 grades only; and 494, or 49 percent, had one or more years beyond high school.

---

[1] See Appendix D for tables presenting distribution of unit members for these and other data. Tables in Appendix D are arranged in order of textual discussion.

Table 2

Number and Percentage Distribution of Units by Median Age of Unit Members

Median age of unit members	Units Number	Units Percent
20 - 24	1	2
25 - 29	10	16
30 - 34	22	35
35 - 39	13	21
40 - 44	3	5
45 - 49	6	10
50 - 54	2	3
55 - 59	2	3
60 - 64	3	5
Total	62	100

Mean of medians[a] 37.4

$\sigma = \pm 9.22$

CV = 25%

---

[a] Information on age was obtained by class intervals, hence the use of medians. Of course, a mean from grouped data could have been calculated. The U. S. Census uses median age in its reports.

Number of Home Economics Courses Taken

The number of home economics courses taken in high school, in college, and in adult education exclusive of home demonstration projects were added together to provide a rough index of home economics training which the unit members had received. The average unit had a mean of 2.4 for its members (Table 4). Over three fourths (77 percent) of the units had means for number of home economics courses taken of 3.0 or less. Only two units, or three percent, of the 62 had averages that were over 5.0.

Table 3

Number and Percentage Distribution of Units According To Median Years of School Completed by Unit Members[a]

Median years of school completed by unit members		Units Number	Units Percent
11.0 - 11.9		8	13
12.0 - 12.9		30	49
13.0 - 13.9		12	19
14.0 - 14.9		7	11
15.0 - 15.9		4	6
16.0 - 16.9		1	2
	Total	62	100
	Mean of medians	12.9	

σ = ±1.1
CV = 9%

[a] The U. S. Census uses median years of school completed in its reports.

A large percentage (81) of the 1,021 members had taken 3.0 or less courses. As many as 25 percent had taken no courses. Only 41 women, or four percent of the total, had taken eight or more courses. These women who had taken large numbers of courses were widely scattered among the 62 units. Thus, in 25 of the units the upper limit for number of courses taken was eight or more. Whether units or individual members are considered, it is clear that the members on the whole had limited formal training in home economics.

Size of Family and Household

In the average unit the mean size of members' families was 4.1 (Table 5). Sixty-one percent of the units had means for family size of 4.0 - 4.9. Of the 1,021 women, 20 percent had families with from six to nine members and 28 percent had families with from one to three members.

Table 4

Number and Percentage Distribution of Units By Mean Number of Home Economics Courses, Exclusive of HD Projects, Taken by Unit Members

Mean number of home economics courses taken by unit members		Units	
		Number	Percent
0.1 - 1.0		5	8
1.1 - 2.0		21	34
2.1 - 3.0		22	35
3.1 - 4.0		9	15
4.1 - 5.0		3	5
5.1 - 6.0		2	3
	Total	62	100
	Mean of means	2.4	

σ = ±1.1
CV = 44%

Table 5

Number and Percentage Distribution of Units By Mean Number in Unit Members' Families

Mean number in families of unit members		Units	
		Number	Percent
1.0 - 1.9		2	3
2.0 - 2.9		6	10
3.0 - 3.9		11	18
4.0 - 4.9		38	61
5.0 - 5.9		5	8
	Total	62	100
	Mean of means	4.1	

σ = ±.8
CV = 20%

In the average unit the mean size of members' households was 4.3 (Table 6). Slightly over three fourths (76 percent) of the units had mean size of households which ranged from 4.0 - 5.9. Only six, or 10 percent, of the 62 units had mean size of households that were under 3.0. Of the 1,020 women giving information, 43 percent had households consisting of five or more members.

Table 6

Number and Percentage Distribution of Units According to Mean Number in Households of Unit Members

Mean number in households of unit members		Units	
		Number	Percent
1.0 - 1.9		1	2
2.0 - 2.9		5	8
3.0 - 3.9		9	14
4.0 - 4.9		40	65
5.0 - 5.9		7	11
	Total	62	100
	Mean of means	4.3	

$\sigma = \pm.8$
CV = 19%

Occupations of Husbands

Professional, technical and kindred workers was the occupational class which ranked first in percent of members' husbands belonging to it in 36, or 58 percent, of the 62 units (Table 7). The highest percent of husbands in this class in the 36 units ranged from 27 to 87 percent. The occupational class, craftsmen, foremen and kindred workers, had the second largest number of units (12, or 20 percent, of the total) with the highest percent of husbands. The highest percent of husbands in this class in the 12 units ranged from 22 to 53 percent.

Table 7

Number and Percentage Distribution of Units According to Occupational Classes Having Highest Percent of Unit Members' Husbands

Occupational classes with ranges of highest percentages	Units with highest percent of members' husbands in given occupational classes	
	Number	Percent
Professional, technical, and kindred workers (27 - 87%)	36	58.0
Managers, officials, and proprietors except farmers (32 - 60%)	4	6.5
Clerical and kindred workers	0	0.0
Sales workers	0	0.0
Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers (22 - 53%)	12	20.0
Operatives and kindred workers (29 - 40%)	5	8.0
Service workers	0	0.0
Laborers	0	0.0
Farmers (43%)	1	1.5
Classes with identical highest percentages		
Professional, technical, and kindred workers; sales workers (33%)	1	1.5
Professional, technical, and kindred workers; managers, officials and proprietors (23%)	1	1.5
Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers; operatives and kindred workers (41%)	1	1.5
Operatives and kindred workers, farmers; retired (20%)	1	1.5
Total	62	100.0

No other occupational class had any large number of units in which it had the highest percent of husbands. Four major occupational classes, i.e., clerical and kindred workers, sales workers, service workers, and laborers, had no units in which these classes had the highest percent of husbands.

Of the 972 members (irrespective of units) who had husbands,[1] 351, or 36 percent, had husbands in the occupational class of professional, technical, and kindred workers; 166, or 17 percent, had husbands who were craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers; and 140, or 14 percent, had husbands who were managers, officials, and proprietors (except farmers). No other occupational class had over 10 percent of the husbands.

Thus, when both units and total membership are considered, it is quite clear that the women who were participating in the units were primarily from the upper occupational classes. However, on the basis of status rank, an interesting reversal of position occurs for two of the upper occupational groups. The craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers class had more husbands than did the managers, officials, and proprietors (except farmers).

A few (48) of the families of the members had no husbands present. Information was obtained on the occupation of the head of the family (or household) for 43 of these families. Twenty were unemployed or retired, the next largest number (13) were clerical or kindred workers.

Employment of Members

The average unit had 31.3 percent of its members employed (by self, someone, or both) full- or part-time or some combination thereof (Table 8).[2] Twenty-six percent of the 62 units had from 40 - 49 percent of their members employed, 26 percent had from 20 - 29 percent, and 16 percent had from 30 - 39 percent. Altogether, 68 percent of the 62 units had from 20 - 49 percent of their members employed.

---

[1] Forty-eight members had no husband in the family and one gave no information on occupation of husband.

[2] Full-time employment was defined as 35 hours or more per week, and part-time as less than 35 hours per week.

Table 8

Number and Percentage Distribution of Units According to Percent of Unit Members Employed Either By Self, Someone, or Both, Either Full- or Part-Time

Percent of unit members employed	Units Number	Units Percent
0	2	3
1 - 9	4	7
10 - 19	7	11
20 - 29	16	26
30 - 39	10	16
40 - 49	16	26
50 - 59	5	8
60 - 69	2	3
Total	62	100
Mean	31.3	

σ = ±14.9
CV = 48%

The average unit had 25.2 percent of its members who were employed full- or part-time by someone and 7.8 percent of its members who were self-employed full- or part-time (Tables 9 and 10). Only three, or five percent, of the 62 units had no members who were employed full- or part-time by someone, whereas 21, or 34 percent, had no members who were self-employed full- or part-time.[1]

If all 1,021 of the unit members are considered, 32 percent were employed either part- or full-time by someone, or by self, or by both. Ten percent of the 1,021 members were employed full-time by someone, 16 percent part-time, and 74 percent not at all. Only one percent of the 1,021 members were self-employed full-time, seven percent part-time, and 92 percent not at all. Thus, while about one fourth of the members were employed full- or part-time by someone, only eight percent were self-employed full- or part-time. It appears, therefore, that while employment among the members was not extensive, it was widely distributed among the various units.

---

[1] Twenty members were employed by someone and also by self.

Table 9

Number and Percentage Distribution of Units According to Percent of Unit Members Employed By Someone, Either Full- or Part-Time

Percent of members employed by someone either full- or part-time	Units	
	Number	Percent
0	3	5
1 - 9	6	10
10 - 19	9	14
20 - 29	26	42
30 - 39	8	13
40 - 49	7	11
50 - 59	3	5
Total	62	100
Mean	25.2	

$\sigma = \pm 12.7$
CV = 50%

Participation of Members in Organizations

Each member was asked to indicate the organizations to which she belonged and what offices she held. From this information a participation score was calculated.[1] In the average

---

[1] The participation score was the sum of the number of organizations belonged to plus three times the number of offices held.

Table 10

Number and Percentage Distribution of Units According to Percent of Unit Members Self-Employed, Either Full- or Part-Time

Percent of members self-employed either full- or part-time	Units Number	Units Percent
0	21	34
1 - 9	17	27
10 - 19	17	27
20 - 29	6	10
30 - 39	1	2
Total	62	100
Mean	7.8	

$\sigma = \pm 7.8$
CV = 100%

unit the mean participation score was 7.9 (Table 11). Fifty-two, or 84 percent, of the 62 units had mean participation scores in the class of 5.0 - 9.9. Only seven units had mean scores of 10.0 and over. The coefficient of variation for the mean of the means was 30 percent. Thus, for about two thirds of the units the mean of the means was a fairly representative figure.

In the average unit the mean number of organizations to which the members belonged was 4.0. Only five units, or eight percent of the 62, had means of less than 3.0 and only four units, or seven percent, had means in the class interval of 5.0 - 7.9.

Of the 1,021 members, 51 percent had participation scores under 7.0. Twenty-five percent of the members had scores above 10.0. Only 31 members belonged to just one organization and only nine to nine or more organizations. The organizations to which the greatest number of the women belonged were: church or synagogue, 929, and PTA, 397.

Table 11

Number and Percentage Distribution of Units According to Mean Participation Score of Unit Members

Mean participation score of unit members		Units Number	Units Percent
0.1 - 4.9		3	5
5.0 - 9.9		52	84
10.0 - 14.9		6	9
15.0 - 19.9		1	2
	Total	62	100
	Mean of means	7.9	
σ = ±2.37			
CV = 30%			

Status of HD Units Compared to Other Organizations

The women were asked to rate the organizations to which they belonged according to their perception of the organization's standing in their community. Following is a list of the organizations to which 29 or more women belonged, arrayed according to their average rating score.[1]

Rank		Average rating score
1.	Church or synagogue (N=903)[2]	4.48
2.	Sunday or Sabbath school (N=194)	4.42
3.	Auxiliary of veterans (N=29)	4.24
4.	Altar or Rosary Society (N=166)	4.21
5.	Church circle or fellowship (N=137)	4.15
6.	Women's Society for Christian Service (N=67)	4.13
7.	Other church organizations (N=230)	4.08
8.	Garden club (N=29)	3.90

---

[1] The women were given five levels for rating an organization, i.e., very high, high, average, low, and very low. The levels were assigned numerical values from five to one.

[2] N is the number of women belonging to and rating.

Rank		Average rating score
9.	Women's club (N=101)	3.85
10.	Home Demonstration Unit (N=947)	3.84
11.	PTA (N=384)	3.77
12.	Home Bureau (N=30)	3.73
13.	Sorority, lodge, or fraternal (N=148)	3.66
14.	Sports or hobby (N=175)	3.58

Of the 14 organizations or kinds of organizations included in the above tabulations, the HD unit ranked tenth from the top. For these women who were members of HD units, the church and Sunday or Sabbath school ranked high, first and second respectively.[1]

In the average unit the percent of members who rated their units *high* and *very high* in community standing was 63.1 (Table 12). Sixty-two percent of the 62 units had percentages of the members who rated them *high* and *very high* ranging from 60.0 - 100.0. Only 14 percent of the units had percentages below 40.0, and there was no unit where less than 10 percent of the members rated their units *high* or *very high*.

Net Family Income: 1964

In order to obtain a general index of the income level of the members of the units, each member was asked to indicate in which of three general classes she thought her family's net income for 1964 would fall.[2] The three classes were *less than $5,000*, *$5,000 - 9,999*, and *$10,000+*.

The distribution of the units for each level of income, according to the percent of members in the units falling into each

---

[1] The status ranking of organizations presented here has a serious weakness, namely, the small number of women who rated some of the organizations.

[2] Net income was defined as salary or wage or income from farm or business after expenses.

Table 12

Number and Percentage Distribution of Units According to Percent of Unit Members Rating Unit Very High or High

Percent of members rating very high or high	Units Number	Units Percent
0.0 - 9.9	0	0
10.0 - 19.9	2	3
20.0 - 29.9	3	5
30.0 - 39.9	4	6
40.0 - 49.9	8	13
50.0 - 59.9	7	11
60.0 - 69.9	13	21
70.0 - 79.9	12	20
80.0 - 89.9	5	8
90.0 - 99.9	2	3
100	6	10
Total	62	100
Mean	63.1	

σ = ±22.8
CV = 36%

class is presented in Table 13. Forty-five percent of the units had no members with incomes less than $5,000 and only one unit had 50 percent or more of its members with less than $5,000 net income. On the other hand, 80 percent of the units had 50 percent or more of their members with net incomes from $5,000 - 9,999. Only 15 percent of the units had 50 percent or more of their members in the income class, $10,000+. Thus, it is clear that these HD units were composed predominantly of members in the middle income class of $5,000 - 9,999.

When the entire membership of all 62 units is considered, 67 percent of the 983 members giving information fell in the class of $5,000 - 9,999. The median for these 983 members was $8,119.

Table 13

Number and Percentage Distribution of Units According to Percent of Unit Members Whose Net Incomes Were Less Than $5,000; $5,000 - 9,999; and $10,000+: 1964

Percent of unit members	Less than $5,000		$5,000 - 9,999		$10,000+	
	No. of units	Percent of units	No. of units	Percent of units	No. of units	Percent of units
None	28	45	0	0	7	11
1 - 9	14	23	0	0	7	11
10 - 19	9	14	2	3	14	23
20 - 29	2	3	3	5	14	23
30 - 39	5	8	4	6	3	5
40 - 49	3	5	4	6	8	12
50 - 59	1	2	11	18	5	8
60 - 69	0	0	4	6	3	5
70 - 79	0	0	20	33	0	0
80 - 89	0	0	6	10	1	2
90 - 99	0	0	7	11	0	0
100	0	0	1	2	0	0
Total	62	100	62	100	62	100

Characteristics Derived from Relationship of Members to Units by Units and for Total Membership

Number of Members in Units

The 62 units had an average (mean) of 17.9 members per unit (Table 14). There were no units with five or less members. About one third (34 percent) had from 16 - 20 members. Almost three fourths (72 percent) of the 62 units had from 11 - 25 members. Very few of the units had large memberships; three had from 26 - 30; three, from 31 - 35; and one had 36 members.

Table 14

Number and Percentage Distribution of Units According to Number of Members: 1965-66

Number of unit members	Units Number	Units Percent
1 - 5	0	0
6 - 10	10	16
11 - 15	13	21
16 - 20	21	34
21 - 25	11	17
26 - 30	3	5
31 - 35	3	5
36	1	2
Total	62	100
Mean	17.9	

σ = ±6.9
CV = 39%

Number of Years of Membership

The number of years which women had belonged to a unit should have had some bearing on the nature of the social ties which characterized the unit. The mean number of years of membership in the average unit was 4.5 (Table 15). Eighteen percent, or 11, of the 62 units were new groups. Almost half (48 percent) of the units were composed of members who, on the average, had been members from 0.1 - 4.9 years. Only five units, or eight percent, had an average (mean) number of membership years of 10.0 or more.

Slightly over two thirds (68 percent) of the 1,019 members reporting had been members of their unit for less than five years. Only 14 percent had been members for 10 or more years.

Number of Years Units Had Existed

The average unit had been in existence for 9.4 years (Table 16). The 62 units were widely distributed in terms of years of

Table 15

Number and Percentage Distribution of Units According to Mean Number of Years of Unit Membership

Mean number of years of unit membership	Units Number	Units Percent
0 (new)[a]	11	18
0.1 - 4.9	30	48
5.0 - 9.9	16	26
10.0 - 14.9	2	3
15.0 - 19.9	3	5
Total	62	100
Mean of means	4.5	

σ = ±4.0
CV = 89%

---

[a] This zero indicates new units in which all of the members were new and hence had zero years of membership.

existence. The range was from 0 - 40 years. However, 69 percent of the 62 units had been in existence for 10 or less years. Only 11 percent of the units had existed for 20 years or more.

Friendship Percent Score of Unit Members

This score was designed to indicate the social character of the units. Each unit member who was interviewed was presented with a list of the names of all of the members of her unit and asked to indicate the degree of her friendship with each by checking one of four choices, i.e., one of closest, an average acquaintance, know very little, and do not know. Numerical values--3, 2, 1, 0--were assigned to these respective choices. Each respondent's score was then summed and a percentage score, based on the number of members minus one (the respondent) calculated.

Table 16

Number and Percentage Distribution of Units According to Number of Years Unit Had Been in Existence[a]

Number of years unit had existed	Units Number	 Percent
0 (new)[b]	11	17.7
1	1	1.6
2	3	4.8
3	1	1.6
5	1	1.6
6	3	4.8
7	2	3.2
8	7	11.3
9	6	9.7
10	8	12.9
11	1	1.6
12	2	3.2
13	3	4.8
15	2	3.2
16	2	3.2
17	2	3.2
20	3	4.8
23	1	1.6
24	1	1.6
30	1	1.6
40	1	1.6
Total	62	99.6[c]
Mean	9.4	

$\sigma = \pm 7.8$
CV = 83%

---

[a] Information provided by unit chairmen.

[b] This zero indicates new units which had been organized for less than a year.

[c] Does not add to 100 because of rounding.

The average unit had a mean percent score of 58.2 (Table 17). This suggests that the average unit was only slightly over half way to a perfect friendship group (100 percent score).

Nine, or 14 percent, of the 62 units had mean percent scores of 80 or more. The highest mean percent score was 88.9 and the lowest, 33.9. The range in percentage points of the members' scores within the units was often fairly large. Moreover, in each unit there was at least one person who had a fairly high percent score. Thus, the highest friendship percent scores in the 62 units ranged from 50 to 100.

Table 17

Number and Percentage Distribution of Units According to Mean Friendship Percent Scores of Units

Mean friendship percent scores of units		Units	
		Number	Percent
30.0 - 39.9		5	8
40.0 - 49.9		10	16
50.0 - 59.9		17	28
60.0 - 69.9		21	34
70.0 - 79.9		7	11
80.0 - 89.9		2	3
	Total	62	100
	Mean of means	58.2	

σ = ±11.5
CV = 20%

Of the 1,020 members who provided information for calculation of a friendship score, 51 percent had friendship percent scores under 60 percent. Sixty-eight, or seven percent, of the 1,020 members had friendship scores of 80 percent or more. Only nine percent had friendship percent scores that were under 30.

Percent of Unit Members Who Were Close Friends

The mean percent of members who were claimed as close friends by other members in the average unit was 22.1 (Table 18). Fifty-six percent of the 62 units had mean percentages of members who were claimed as close friends that were under 20 percent. Only two, or four percent, of the 62 units had mean percentages of 50 or more of their members who were claimed as close friends.

Table 18

Number and Percentage Distribution of Units According to Mean Percent of Unit Members Who Were Claimed as Close Friends by Other Members

Mean percent of unit members claimed as close friends		Units Number	Units Percent
0.0 - 9.9		3	5
10.0 - 19.9		32	51
20.0 - 29.9		15	24
30.0 - 39.9		7	11
40.0 - 49.9		3	5
50.0 - 59.9		1	2
60.0 - 69.9		1	2
	Total	62	100
	Mean of means	22.1	

σ = ±10.8
CV = 49%

Of the 1,020 women who gave information on friendship, 59.7 percent claimed close friendship with less than 20 percent of their unit's members. In fact only 7.7 percent of the members indicated close friendship with 50 percent or more of their unit's members. It would appear, therefore, that on the whole there was no excessive number of members who had close friendships with other members of their units.

Percent of Unit Members Known Very Little

The mean percent of members known very little by the different members of the average unit was 23.1 (Table 19). Eighty-five percent of the units had mean percentages of members who knew other members very little which ranged from 10.0 - 39.9 percent. Forty-five percent of the units fell in the class interval of 20.0 - 29.9.

Sixty-seven percent of 1,020 members knew very little only a relatively small percent (0 - 29) of the members of their units. Only 18 percent knew very little from 40 - 100 percent of the members of their units.

Table 19

Number and Percentage Distribution of Units According to Mean Percent of Unit Members Who Were Known Very Little By Other Members

Mean percent of unit members who were known very little	Units Number	 Percent
0.0	1	2
0.1 - 9.9	6	9
10.0 - 19.9	13	21
20.0 - 29.9	28	45
30.0 - 39.9	12	19
40.0 - 49.9	1	2
50.0 - 59.9	1	2
Total	62	100
Mean of means	23.1	

σ = ±9.7
CV = 42%

Percent of Unit Members Not Known

The mean percent of unit members not known by other members for the average unit was 12.0 (Table 20). Almost one fourth (24 percent) of the 62 units had mean percentages of members not known by the other members ranging from 20.0 - 49.9. On the other hand, about three fourths (76 percent) of the units had mean percentages which were under 20.0. Eight, or 13 percent, of the units had no member who did not know all of the other members.

Table 20

Number and Percentage Distribution of Units According to Mean Percent of Unit Members Who Were Not Known by Other Members

Mean percent of unit members who were not known	Units	
	Number	Percent
0.0	8	13
0.1 - 9.9	24	39
10.0 - 19.9	15	24
20.0 - 29.9	12	19
30.0 - 39.9	1	2
40.0 - 49.9	2	3
Total	62	100
Mean of means	12.0	

σ = ±10.4
CV = 87%

Of the 1,020 women from whom information was obtained, 44 percent indicated there was no one in their unit whom they did not know. However, nine percent of the women were new enough in their groups that they did not know from 50 to 100 percent of the women in their unit. Only a few of the women, nine, or one percent, did not know 90 percent and over of the members of their unit.

Visiting Among Unit Members

The members of the average unit had a mean of 24.7 percent of other members whom they had visited one or more times in the past three months (Table 21). In only a few of the units was there any indication, on the basis of this index, of an extensive amount of visiting among members. Slightly over three fourths (76 percent) of the units had a mean of less than 30 percent of members visited by other members.

Of the 1,020 members who reported on visiting other members, almost three fourths (73 percent) had visited less than 30 percent of the other members in the past three months. Only nine percent of the 1,020 had visited 50 percent or more of the other members.

Table 21

Number and Percentage Distribution of Units According to Mean Percent of Unit Members Visited by Other Members One or More Times in Past Three Months

Mean percent of members visited by different members one or more times in past three months		Units	
		Number	Percent
0.1 - 9.9		3	5
10.0 - 19.9		26	42
20.0 - 29.9		18	29
30.0 - 39.9		7	11
40.0 - 49.9		5	8
50.0 - 59.9		2	3
60.0 - 69.9		0	0
70.0 - 79.9		0	0
80.0 - 89.9		1	2
	Total	62	100
	Mean of means	24.7	

$\sigma = \pm 13.6$
CV = 55%

Number of Women Recruited for Unit Membership

Individual members rather than units constitute the unit of analysis for recruitment activities. While 43 percent of the 784 members who reported had never recruited a member, 57 percent had recruited one or more members (Table 22). As high as 17 percent of these members had recruited three or more members. The median number of members recruited was 1.3 with zero included, and 2.2 with zero excluded.

Table 22

Number and Percentage Distribution of Unit Members According to Number of Members Recruited Since Joining the Unit

Number of women recruited	Members Number	Members Percent
0	339	43
1	192	24
2	124	16
3	53	6
4	20	2
5	21	3
6	4	1
7	6	1
8	4	1
9 or more	21	3
Total	784[a]	100
Median (with 0 included)[b]	1.3	
Q = .95		
CV = 73%		
Median (without 0)	2.2	
Q = .85		
CV = 39%		

[a] Of the 1,021 members interviewed 234 were new members who did not consider themselves eligible for answering this question, although 74 other new members did answer it and indicated they had recruited members. In addition, three gave no information on recruitment.

[b] Because of an open-ended category of 9 or more, used in obtaining the data, it was not possible to compute means.

Reasons for Belonging to Units

The 1,021 women who were interviewed were asked to check a list of nine possible reasons, and given an opportunity to write in other reasons for their belonging to HD units.[1] They were instructed to check as many reasons as applied. The most frequently checked reasons were: 1) because I want to learn more about the best ways to run my household (such as diet, sewing, buying, managing my work) (94 percent) and 2) because I enjoy (or expected to enjoy) the social life the unit provides (82 percent).

The rank order of the nine reasons according to percent choosing each is as follows:

Reasons	Percent choosing (N=1,021)
1. Because I want to learn more about the best ways to run my household.	94
2. Because I enjoy (or expect to enjoy) the social life which the unit provides.	82

---

[1] The checklist of reasons was as follows:

1) ____ Because I enjoy (or expected to enjoy) the social life which the unit provides.

2) ____ Because I want to learn more about the best ways to run my household (such as diet, sewing, buying, managing my work).

3) ____ Because I want to learn more about community problems and how to work on them.

4) ____ Because I want to learn more about child-rearing.

5) ____ Because I want to learn more about husband-wife relationships.

6) ____ Because I want to obtain some information about

a) ________________________________ (fill in)

b) ________________________________ (fill in)

c) ________________________________ (fill in)

7) ____ Because a close friend wanted me to belong.

8) ____ Because I have belonged to this unit for a long time.

9) ____ Because I like to have an evening, afternoon, or day away from home.

10) ____ Other ________________________________

Reasons	Percent choosing (N=1,021)
3. Because I want to have an evening, afternoon, or day away from home	50
4. Because I want to obtain some information about one or more (specifically indicated) matters	40
5. Because I want to learn more about child-rearing.	35
6. Because I want to learn more about community problems	34
7. Because a close friend wanted me to join	21
8. Because I have belonged to this unit for a long time	18
9. Because I want to learn more about husband-wife relationships	17

The magnitude of the percentages dropped sharply following the reasons which are in first and second position. While the women looked upon the social life of the group as important, strong group ties, such as a *close friend wanting one to join* or *belonging to the group a long time* were chosen by relatively small percentages of the women.[1]

As would be expected from the percent (94) of the 1,021 women choosing *because I want to learn more about the best ways to run my household*, the average unit had a mean percent choosing this reason of 93.9 (Table 23). In no unit was the percent below 60, and 40 percent of the units had 100 percent of those reporting who checked this reason. Again as would be expected from the percent (82) of the 1,021 women who checked *because I enjoy (or expected to enjoy) the social life the unit provides*, the average unit had a mean percent of 81.7 (Table 24). Twelve, or 19 percent, of the 62 units had percentages in the category of 50 - 69. Eighteen, or 29 percent of the units, were in the class of 90 - 100 percent of members choosing this reason.

---

[1] Other reasons written in were: educational purposes, enjoy activities offered, enjoyed former experiences (or mother did), get acquainted with neighbors, enjoy being with other people.

Table 23

Number and Percentage Distribution of Units According to Percent of Unit Members Belonging to Unit Because They Wanted to Learn the Best Ways to Run Households

Percent of unit members belonging to unit because they wanted to learn best ways to run households		Units	
		Number	Percent
60 - 69		1	2
70 - 79		1	2
80 - 89		10	16
90 - 99		25	40
100		25	40
	Total	62	100
	Mean	93.9	

σ = ±7.25
CV = 8%

Table 24

Number and Percentage Distribution of Units According to Percent of Unit Members Belonging to Unit Because They Enjoyed Or Expected to Enjoy Its Social Life

Percent of unit members belonging to unit because they enjoyed its social life		Units	
		Number	Percent
50 - 59		4	6
60 - 69		8	13
70 - 79		10	16
80 - 89		22	36
90 - 99		11	18
100		7	11
	Total	62	100
	Mean	81.7	

σ = ±12.7
CV = 16%

What Members Expected to Learn in Unit

The interviewees were asked to state what they expected to learn through their participation in unit projects. The answers to this question overlapped, as might be expected, with the responses to the checklist of reasons for belonging to units. The answers given by 988 of the interviewees were classified under the 13 categories in Table 25. The most frequently occurring expectation was improve homemaking skills and keep up-to-date on new ideas and techniques, with 27 percent giving this response. This answer was followed closely by gain more knowledge--new ideas, better methods--more about whatever is taught with 24 percent. The third ranking response was learn more about sewing (and other homemaking) with 10 percent. The first two answers are quite general and not entirely dissimilar. The third ranking answer and several of those with lesser frequencies were responses that were related to specific kinds of learning, such as sewing, cooking, crafts, decorating, and such miscellaneous skills as gardening, flower arranging, floor care, child care, and home nursing.

Leadership in Units

Number of Different Leadership Positions Held[1]

The average unit had a mean of 1.9 different positions ever held by its members (Table 26). Slightly over 80 percent of the 62 units had a mean of less than 3.0. In the

---

[1] The leadership positions which each interviewee was asked about were: chairman, vice-chairman, secretary, treasurer, and project leader. Each different project leadership was counted as one position.

Table 25

Number and Percentage Distribution of Unit Members According to What Expected to Learn Through Unit Projects

What expected to learn through unit projects	Members Number	Members Percent
Improve homemaking skills and/or keep up-to-date on new ideas and techniques	271	27
Gain more knowledge--new ideas, better methods--more about whatever is taught	242	24
Learn more about sewing (and other homemaking)	97	10
Learn to be a better homemaker	84	9
Learn to make things for the home--crafts	79	8
New ideas in cooking (and other homemaking skills)	62	6
Social reasons--companionship, meet new people--plus learn something new	35	4
Learn about home decorating, interior design, etc.	33	3
Miscellaneous homemaking skills--gardening, flower arranging, floor care, child care, home nursing	26	3
Christmas decorations and ideas	20	2
Doesn't know--doesn't get to meetings--or too new to say	18	2
Learn by participating	11	1
Doesn't expect to learn much	10	1
Total	988	100

Table 26

Number and Percentage Distribution of Units by Mean Number of Different Leadership Positions Held by Unit Members[a]

Mean number of different unit leadership positions held		Units	
		Number	Percent
0.1 - .9		14	22
1.0 - 1.9		20	32
2.0 - 2.9		18	29
3.0 - 3.9		9	15
4.0 - 4.9		1	2
	Total	62	100
	Mean of means	1.9	

$\sigma = \pm 1.0$
CV = 53%

[a] Includes old and new members; 24 percent of the new members were holding leadership positions.

average unit, 36 percent of the members had never held a leadership position (Table 27).

If the total membership irrespective of units is considered, 115, or 11.3 percent, of the 1,021 women had held from five to nine positions since joining their unit. On the other hand, as many as 348, or 34.1 percent, of the 1,021 women had held only one or two different positions.

Specific Leadership Positions Held

For those holding one or more leadership positions, the percentages who were holding or had held specific kinds of

Table 27

Number and Percentage Distribution of Units According to Percent of Unit Members Never Holding a Leadership Position[a]

Percent of unit members never holding leadership position	Units	
	Number	Percent
0	3	5
1 - 9	4	6
10 - 19	4	6
20 - 29	18	29
30 - 39	12	20
40 - 49	12	20
50 - 59	1	2
60 - 69	4	6
70 - 79	2	3
80 - 89	2	3
Total	62	100
Mean	33.9	

σ = ±19.8
CV = 58%

[a] Includes old and new members; 24 percent of the new members were holding leadership positions.

positions are given in Table 28. It should be remembered, however, that the same individual may have held more than one of these positions.[1] A little over one third of the members who held one or more positions had served as unit chairman, an equal proportion as vice-chairman, and a like proportion as secretary. One fourth had served as treasurer. Two fifths (40 percent) of these leaders had been project leaders for one project. Only seven percent had been leaders for four projects. Altogether, 80 percent of the women who had held one or more leadership positions had been project leaders at some time.

---

[1] No information was obtained on number of times positions were held.

Table 28

Percent of Unit Members Who Held or Had Held One or More Leadership Positions According to Specific Positions Held

Positions	Percent holding
Chairman of unit (N=649)	35
Vice-chairman of unit (N=649)	35
Secretary of unit (N=649)	35
Treasurer of unit (N=649)	25
Project leader--one project only (N=649)	40
Project leader--two projects (N=646)[a]	21
Project leader--three projects (N=646)[a]	13
Project leader--four projects (N=646)[a]	7

[a] Three interviewees listed only one project for which they had been leader but indicated they had led other projects without listing or giving any number.

How Project Leaders Were Selected

As reported by the unit chairmen, slightly over one half (51 percent) of the 62 units selected their project leaders by having them volunteer (Table 29). Another 37 percent of the units combined volunteering and the unit chairman asking women to be leaders. Eight percent of the units were reported to have used these two methods plus some unit member asking the person to serve as leader.

The reports of the unit chairmen on the methods of selecting project leaders were partially supported by the reports of individuals who had been project leaders. Thus, a little over 90 percent of the members who had ever been project leaders reported they had volunteered.

Table 29

Number and Percentage Distribution of Units According to Methods by Which Project Leaders Were Selected[a]

Methods by which project leaders selected	Units Number	Units Percent
By volunteering	32	51
By chairman asking the person to be leader	1	2
By some unit member asking person to be leader	0	0
Combination of (1) and (2)	23	37
Combination of (1), (2), and (3)	5	8
Other	1	2
Total	62	100

[a] Information provided by unit chairmen.

Percent of Membership Years Devoted to Leadership

For each member the percent of membership years devoted to leadership in her unit was calculated. This percent was obtained by dividing the sum of years of leadership of each member reporting by number of years of her membership in the unit times 100. The average unit had a mean of 59.8 percent (Table 30). In only three units was the average 100 percent or more. However, in 58 percent of the 62 units, the mean percent of years of leadership was 50 and over, and no unit had a mean percent of less than 20.

When individual members (1,019) are considered, the percent of membership years devoted to various leadership positions ranged from 0 to over 250.[1] Slightly over one third (36 percent) of the women had given no time to leadership. However, 29.1 percent had devoted from 100 to 250+ percent of their membership years to leadership; this means that these women were holding from one to

---

[1] Includes new members.

2.5 positions per year. Thus, taking the membership as a whole, between one fourth and one third of the women had assumed a considerable load of leadership. It should be remembered, however, that these women appear to have been scattered over a number of units.

Table 30

Number and Percentage Distribution of Units According to Mean Percent of Membership Years of Unit Members Devoted to Leadership[a]

Mean percent of membership years of unit members devoted to leadership		Units	
		Number	Percent
20.0 - 29.9		5	8
30.0 - 39.9		9	14
40.0 - 49.9		11	17
50.0 - 59.9		12	19
60.0 - 69.9		6	10
70.0 - 79.9		7	11
80.0 - 89.9		8	13
90.0 - 99.9		1	2
100.0 - 109.9		1	2
110.0 - 119.9		0	0
120.0 - 129.9		0	0
130.0 - 139.9		1	2
150		1	2
	Total	62	100
	Mean of means	59.4	
σ = ±24.8 CV = 42%			

---

[a] Percent of membership years devoted to leadership = sum of years of leadership of each member reporting divided by number of years of her membership in unit times 100. Women who held leadership positions but had been members for less than one year were considered to have been members for a year in calculating the percentages.

Difficulty in Finding Project Leaders

For the average unit the percent of members who thought it difficult to find project leaders was 35.6 (Table 31). In less than one third (29 percent) of the 62 units was the percent 50 or more. No one thought it was difficult in 13 percent of the units.

Of the 874 members who answered the question as to the difficulty of finding project leaders, 559, or 64 percent, did not think there was any difficulty.

Table 31

Number and Percentage Distribution of Units According to Percent of Unit Members Who Thought That Project Leaders Were Difficult to Find[a]

Percent of unit members who thought project leaders were difficult to find	Units	
	Number	Percent
0.0	8	13
0.1 - 9.9	3	5
10.0 - 19.9	13	21
20.0 - 29.9	5	8
30.0 - 39.9	12	19
40.0 - 49.9	3	5
50.0 - 59.9	1	2
60.0 - 69.9	5	8
70.0 - 79.9	8	13
80.0 - 89.9	2	3
90.0 - 99.9	0	0
100	2	3
Total	62	100
Mean	35.6	

$\sigma = \pm 28.4$
CV = 80%

---

[a] Excluded from the calculation of the percentages were some who gave no information and some, who because they were new members, could not answer the question on difficulty of finding project leaders.

The reasons given by 287 women who thought it difficult to find leaders are presented in Table 32. The data are for the number and percent mentioning each reason so that one woman sometimes gave more than one reason.

Table 32

Number and Percent of Unit Members Reporting According to Reasons Offered for Why Project Leaders Were Hard to Find

Reasons hard to find	No. of persons mentioning	Percent of persons who thought project leaders hard to find (N=287)
Small children--babysitting problem	116	40.4
Lack of confidence in ability to teach; timidity	79	27.5
Working	49	17.1
Training inconvenient (parking problems, too long, hard to get to, held in daytime when members not free)	48	16.7
Transportation problem	47	16.4
Lack of time; too busy	35	12.2
Lack of interest in project (too technical; repetitious)	32	11.1
Too much bother; too lazy; let others do the work	8	2.8
Other (not enough members, same ones always volunteer)	19	6.6

Care of small children or babysitting was the reason mentioned by 116 women, or 40.4 percent of the 287 who gave reasons. The second ranking category in terms of frequency of mention was lack of confidence in ability to teach or timidity with 79 women, or 27.5 percent of the 287 mentioning it.

Project Teaching

Number of Extension and Nonextension Projects in Which Participated (1964-65)

In four, or eight percent, of the 50 units to which the question applied, the mean number of extension projects in which members participated in 1964-65 ranged from 8.0 to 10.9 (Table 33).[1] On the other hand, the mean range of 15, or 30 percent, of the 50 units was from 1.0 to 3.9. The average unit had a mean of 4.95 projects in which its members participated in 1964-65.

If the 707 unit members who gave information on this question are considered, 35, or five percent, had participated in from 10 to 15 projects. On the other hand, 249, or 35 percent, of the 707 had participated in three or less projects. About one third (33 percent) of 707 members had not participated in in any nonextension project, and 51 percent had participated in from one to three such projects. Only a few of the members reported participation in six or more nonextension projects. Thus, it appears that nonextension projects constituted only a small part of the total programs of the units.

Reaction of Unit Members to Project Teaching

The 852 unit members who had been members long enough to have had some experience with project teaching gave their reactions to five aspects of this teaching. The five aspects were: 1) length of lessons, 2) amount of discussion, 3) project leaders' training, 4) subject matter--general vs. concrete, and

---

[1] In addition to carrying projects offered by Cooperative Extension, some units had projects such as crafts, etc., which utilize resources other than extension. Because of the small number involved for some units, data for other projects by units are not presented.

5) attention given. A rating score was devised which comprehended these five aspects and had a maximum range from +5 to -5.[1]

The average unit which had been organized long enough to have had some project teaching had a mean score of 3.7 for its members' ratings of project teaching (Table 34). All of the 57 units had plus means. Thirty-seven percent of the units had high means for the teaching, from 4.0 to 5.0. Only 14 percent of the units had mean ratings from 1.0 to 2.9.

The five aspects of project teaching fell into the following rank order according to the mean percent of women in the 57 units who rated them as *about right*, *adequate*, *well balanced*, or *good*:

Rank	Mean percent for 57 units
1 - Training of project leaders (adequate)	93.3
2 - Attention (good)	86.8

---

[1] The details of the scoring follow:

Item		Score values
Length of lessons	Too short	-1
	Too long	-1
	About right	+1
	Varies	0
Amount of discussion	Too much discussion	-1
	Too little discussion	-1
	About right	+1
	Varies	0
Project leaders' training	Don't have adequate training	-1
	Do have adequate training	+1
	Varies	0
Subject matter--general vs. concrete	Too general	-1
	Well balanced	+1
	Too concrete	-1
	Varies	0
Attention given	Proper attention not given	-1
	Good attention given	+1
	Varies	0

Rank	Mean percent for 57 units
3 - Length of lessons (about right)	85.2
4 - Amount of discussion (about right).	80.8
5 - Subject matter (well balanced as between concrete and general)	80.8

If the 852 members who gave their reactions to the five phases of project teaching are considered, 50.6 percent of them gave the project teaching (combining all five phases) the highest possible rating, namely, +5. Only 5.1 percent of the members gave a negative rating, from -1 to -3.

Table 33

Number and Percentage Distribution of Units According to Mean Number of Extension Projects in Which Unit Members Participated During 1964-65

Mean number of extension projects in which unit members participated during 1964-65		Units	
		Number	Percent
1.0 - 1.9		1	2
2.0 - 2.9		7	14
3.0 - 3.9		7	14
4.0 - 4.9		10	20
5.0 - 5.9		15	30
6.0 - 6.9		5	10
7.0 - 7.9		1	2
8.0 - 8.9		3	6
9.0 - 9.9		0	0
10.0 - 10.9		1	2
	Total	50[a]	100
	Mean of means	4.95	

σ = ±1.81
CV = 3.7%

---

[a] Eleven new units not in existence in the 1964-65 program year and one unit that discontinued operation in that year but had existed before and has now been reorganized were not included.

Table 34

Number and Percentage Distribution of Units According to Mean Scores on Reaction to Project Teaching in the Units

Unit mean scores on reaction to project teaching[a]		Units	
		Number	Percent
1.0 - 1.9		2	4
2.0 - 2.9		6	10
3.0 - 3.9		28	49
4.0 - 4.9		20	35
5.0		1	2
	Total	57	100
	Mean of means	3.7	

σ = ±.85
CV = 23.5%

---

[a] Range of possible scores was from +5 to -5.

Following the rating of the five phases of project teaching, the members were asked to give their comments about the teaching. Of the 662 interviewees who commented, 41.2 percent gave favorable comments, with the teaching being considered good or excellent (Table 35). Another 6.2 percent also made favorable comments but accompanied them with reservations or suggestions. Thus, almost half of the 662 members appeared to be generally favorable to the project teaching.

The remaining comments tended to be critical or unfavorable. Slightly over one fourth (25.4 percent) of the 662 interviewees made critical comments about the substance and accompanying aids of the projects. These comments included not of interest, more crafts--fewer discussions, projects too long for time allotted, projects too detailed or technical, more visual aids and/or printed material needed, subject matter too general, too much literature, and kit projects a waste of time. Comments made by 54 women, or 8.2 percent of the total, reflected an unfavorable attitude toward the project leaders.

Table 35

Number and Percentage Distribution of Unit Members According to Classes of Comments About Project Teaching

Comments about project teaching	Unit members Number	 Percent
Favorable comments--teaching excellent or good	273	41.2
Favorable comments but with reservations or suggestions--less talk, more doing (crafts, etc.)--members not attentive	41	6.2
Quality depends on project leader	28	4.2
Would like agent to teach projects	5	.8
Unfavorable comments about project leaders--too much talk or reading, dull, not enough information	54	8.2
Comments about members--should be more attentive, come late, more should be leaders, miscellaneous	39	5.9
Comments about projects		
Not of interest	21	3.2
More crafts--fewer discussions	46	6.9
Project too long for time allotted	37	5.6
Projects too detailed or technical	13	2.0
More visual aids and/or printed material needed	15	2.3
Subject matter too general	11	1.7
Too much literature	5	.8
Kit projects a waste of time	19	2.9
Unfavorable comments on specific projects--stretch fabrics, pre-adolescence, Christmas	14	2.1
Comments on training		
Not always enough	11	1.7
Training requires too much time	9	1.4
More than one project leader should take training	9	1.4
Difficulty of getting to training	4	.6
Training done too far in advance	3	.5
Miscellaneous	5	.8
Total	662	100.4[a]

---

[a] Adds to more than 100 because of rounding.

Learning Through Projects (1964-65)

The interviewees were asked to list the three projects in which they had participated in 1964-65 and which they liked best, and to indicate for each either what they had learned that they applied or that they had learned nothing that they could apply.[1] Since for the first project (or only project) listed was the number large enough to warrant attention, only this project is considered here.

In the average unit, 86 percent of the members indicated that for the first or only project listed, they had learned something that they had applied (Table 36). This is a rather high percent, but it should be remembered that this project was probably the one they considered best or was one of two or three projects considered best. As high as 11, or 21 percent, of the 51 units had 100 percent of their members who indicated they had learned something from the project listed first, and no unit had less than 50 percent claiming this.

The list of projects presented in Table 37 includes those which the interviewees listed first of the two or three listed or the only one listed as liking best of those in which they had participated during 1964-65. The three projects listed most frequently were Interior Design (13.1 percent), Versatile Egg (12.9 percent), and Stitch Those Knits (11.9 percent). Other projects which were frequently listed were Flower Arrangements, Cleaning Rugs and Upholstery, and Fabric Finishes.

---

[1] Of 733 women to whom the question was applicable, 689 listed at least one project. The interviewees were given a list of 21 projects for which the Home Demonstration Division had provided either leader training or kit programs during 1964-65.

Table 36

Number and Percentage Distribution of Units According to Percent of Unit Members Who Claimed That From the First or Only Project Listed as Liked Best They Had Learned Something Which Was Applied: 1964-65

Percent of unit members who learned something in project that was applied		Units	
		Number	Percent
50 - 59		4	8
60 - 69		1	2
70 - 79		7	14
80 - 89		12	24
90 - 99		16	31
100		11	21
	Total	51	100
	Mean	86	

σ = ±13.0
CV = 15%

Table 37

Number and Percentage Distribution of Unit Members According to First or Only Project Listed As Liked Best: 1964-65

Projects	Unit members	
	Number	Percent
Interior Design	90	13.1
Versatile Egg	89	12.9
Stitch Those Knits	82	11.9
Flower Arrangements	65	9.4
Cleaning Rugs and Upholstery	51	7.4
Fabric Finishes	36	5.2
Choices at the Cheese Counter	31	4.5
Home Nursing	30	4.4
Meats: New Cuts, New Names	29	4.2
Christmas Decorations and Ideas[a]	27	3.9
Alter to Fit	26	3.8
Time Saving	26	3.8
Dish Gardens	19	2.8
Home Freezing	16	2.3
Crafts[a]	14	2.0
Flower Planting	14	2.0
Pre-Adolescence	12	1.7
Storage	7	1.0
Food and Nutrition--includes miscellaneous topics[a]	6	.9
20th Century Food Developments	6	.9
Poisons	3	.4
Sewing--includes miscellaneous topics[a]	3	.4
Bridge Lessons[a]	2	.3
Seafoods[a]	2	.3
Miscellaneous--includes topics only mentioned once[a]	3	.4
Total	689	99.9[b]

---

[a] These projects (some of which are probably combinations of projects under a general category) were not on the list of projects and kits provided by the Home Economics Division for guidance of the interviewers and interviewees.

[b] Does not add to 100 because of rounding.

A list of the projects which appear in Table 37 is presented below and for each project (or class of projects) the percent of those listing it who claimed they learned something which was applied is given.

Projects	Percent learning something which was applied[1]
Alter to Fit (N=26)[2]	100
Bridge Lessons (N=2)	100
Home Freezing (N=16)	100
Poisons (N=3)	100
Sewing--includes miscellaneous topics (N=3)	100
Stitch Those Knits (N=82)	98
Meats: New Cuts, New Names (N=29)	97
Christmas Decorations and Ideas (N=27)	96
Dish Gardens (N=19)	95
Choices at the Cheese Counter (N=31)	94
Versatile Egg (N=89)	93
Crafts (N=14)	86
Flower Arrangements (N=65)	86
Cleaning Rugs and Upholstery (N=51)	84
Foods and Nutrition--includes miscellaneous topics (N=6)	83
20th Century Food Developments (N=6)	83
Flower Planting (N=14)	79
Time Saving (N=26)	77
Pre-Adolescence (N=12)	75
Interior Design (N=90)	74
Fabric Finishes (N=36)	64
Home Nursing (N=30)	60
Storage (N=7)	57
Seafoods (N=2)	50
Miscellaneous--includes topics only mentioned once (N=3)	100

---

[1] Of the number listing each project (or class of projects) only a few (one to eight) failed to provide information on whether or not they had learned something.

[2] N refers to the number listing each project or class of projects.

It is obvious from the above tabulation that most of the projects listed appearing in Table 37 were those from which large percentages of unit members had learned something which was applied.

Method of Choosing Projects

Of 847 members (exclusive of new members) who gave information on how they thought unit projects were chosen, 695, or 82 percent, thought each member checked her preferences for program topics on a list of projects developed by a county program committee and Cornell University, with those topics receiving the largest number of choices being included in the unit's program. The small number of remaining women were distributed among four other methods plus an other category.[1] Four percent did not know what method was used.

The chairmen of the units were asked with an open-end question to indicate the procedure by which their units selected projects for the program year. Of the 60 chairmen reporting, 45 percent stated that projects offered by Extension were explained, members checked preferences on list, and projects with the greatest number of choices were included in the program (Table 38). For the most part, this procedure agrees with that which 82 percent of the members (including chairmen) indicated as being used in their units. Almost as many chairmen (42 percent) included as modifications of this major procedure a combination of it with the choice of projects not offered by Extension and also decided by vote, or with attempting to find a project leader. A small percent (10) of the chairmen indicated that the unit officers made a preliminary decision on the program and presented it to unit for approval.

---

[1] The question used to secure this information had three forced answers plus other, but in a limited number of cases the interviewees added modifications to the procedure which 82 percent of the interviewees chose, and this resulted in two additional methods.

Table 38

Number and Percentage Distribution of Unit Chairmen According to Procedure Used in Selecting Projects For Program Year

Procedure in selecting projects for program year	Unit chairmen Number	Percent
1. Projects offered by Extension are explained, members check preferences on list or vote, and projects with most votes are included in program	27	45
2. Same as (1) with extra projects not offered by Extension also decided by vote	13	22
3. Same as (1) except that attempt is made to find project leader--if no project leader, that project is eliminated	12	20
4. Officers make preliminary decision on program and present to unit	6	10
5. Members check list of interests; results sent to HD office which advises which projects will be given--then vote is taken and project leaders asked to volunteer	2	3
Total	60	100

Program Planning Meetings

Program Planning Compared to Other Meetings

Of the 58 unit chairmen giving an estimate, almost half (48 percent) thought over 75 percent of the members attended both program planning and other meetings (Table 39). Another

21 percent thought there was no difference, but estimated attendance at both types of meetings between 50 and 75 percent. Slightly more than one fourth (27 percent) of the chairmen thought the program planning meetings were better attended than the other meetings, with comparative estimates of 75+ percent and 50 - 74 percent respectively. Only four percent of the chairmen thought other meetings better attended than program planning ones.

Table 39

Number and Percentage Distribution of Unit Chairmen According to Estimated Percent of Members' Attendance at Program Planning and at Other Meetings

Estimated percent attendance at program planning and at other meetings of units	Unit chairmen Number	Unit chairmen Percent
75%+ p.p. and 75%+ other	28	48
75%+ p.p. and 50-74% other	16	27
50-74% p.p. and 75%+ other	1	2
50-74% p.p. and 50-74% other	12	21
25-49% p.p. and 50-74% other	1	2
Total	58	100

Evaluation of Program Planning Meetings

Those members of units who had ever attended a unit meeting devoted to program planning were asked to indicate whether they considered these meetings useful, of some use, or of little use. In the average unit (excluding three new ones), the percent of women who thought the meetings useful was 88.9 (Table 40).[1]

---

[1] Of 832 members (excluding new members and one who gave no information) only 56 had never attended a program planning meeting.

Sixteen units, or 27 percent, of 59 units had 100 percent of their members who considered the planning meetings useful. Only seven units, or 12 percent, had percentages below 80.

Table 40

Number and Percentage Distribution of Units According to Percent of Unit Members Responding Who Thought Program Planning Meetings Useful

Percent of members responding who thought program planning meetings useful		Units Number	Units Percent
50 - 59		1	2
60 - 69		2	3
70 - 79		4	7
80 - 89		22	37
90 - 99		14	24
100		16	27
	Total	59	100
	Mean	88.9	

σ = ±10.0
CV = 11%

When members irrespective of units are considered, 88 percent of 776 who answered thought the program planning meetings useful;[1] ten percent, of some use; and two percent, of little use. Only five of the 11 women who thought the planning meetings of little use, considered them a waste of time.

Meeting Situations

Number of Times Units Met or Planned to Meet

The 49 units which reported and which were in existence the year or part of year before the members were interviewed, met on the average of 18 times (Table 41). The range of number of times was from one to 52. Twenty-nine percent of the units clustered around the mean, falling in the category of 17 - 19 times. Eighty-four percent of the units met 12 or more times, or once a month or more often. Ten percent met from 30 - 52 times.

---

[1] As would be expected, this percent is approximately the same as the mean percent for the average unit.

During the year 1965-66 the average unit expected to meet 17.7 times, or approximately the same average as that for meetings actually held in 1964-65. The expected range from five to 52 was slightly less than the actual in the previous year. Thirty percent of the units clustered closely around the mean, falling in the category of 17 - 19 times. Eighty-three percent of the units planned to meet 12 or more times, or once a month or more. Eleven percent expected to meet from 30 - 52 times.

Time of Day at Which Units Met

Eighty-nine percent of the 62 units held their meetings in the evening (Table 42). Fifty-one percent of the 62 indicated their hours to be from 8 to 11 or 11:30 p.m. Three units met from 10:00 or 10:30 a.m. to 2:00 or 3:00 p.m., which included the lunch hour, and four held their meetings in the afternoon.

Places at Which Units Met

About three fourths of the 62 units held their meetings only in the houses of the members (Table 43). Sixteen percent used the houses of members in combination with either church, school, or some other public place. A few used public places only.

The unit chairmen were asked to indicate the problems associated with their meeting places. Of the 47 whose units met only in homes, about one third (15) indicated that the homes lacked space, seating capacity, or presented distance problems in the winter. Three other chairmen whose units used homes as well as other meeting places, also complained of the space problem in homes. Churches presented heating problems, and other public buildings, scheduling problems. Of the 62 chairmen, 23 mentioned one or more meeting place problems.

Table 41

Number and Percentage Distribution of Units According to Number of Times Met in 1964-65 and Planned to Meet in 1965-66[a]

Number of times unit met or planned to meet	Met-- 1964-65		Planned to meet-- 1965-66	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1	1	2	0	0
5	0	0	1	2
7	0	0	1	2
9	1	2	1	2
10	3	6	6	9
11	3	6	1	2
12	3	6	5	8
13	1	2	2	3
14	2	4	2	3
15	4	8	4	6
16	5	11	7	10
17	4	8	9	14
18	8	17	5	8
19	2	4	5	8
20	3	6	2	3
21	2	4	2	3
22	1	2	0	0
24	1	2	1	2
26	0	0	1	2
27	0	0	1	2
30	2	4	3	5
34	1	2	1	2
48	1	2	1	2
52	1	2	1	2
Total	49	100	62	100
Mean	18.0 σ = ±8.6 CV = 48%		17.7 σ = ±8.1 CV = 46%	

---

[a] Information provided by unit chairmen.

Table 42

Number and Percentage Distribution of Units According to Hours of Day at Which Met[a]

Hours at which units met	Units Number	Units Percent
7:30 - 10 or 10:30 p.m.	6	10
8:00 - 10 or 10:30 p.m.	5	8
8:00 - 11 or 11:30 p.m.	32	51
8:00 - 12 or 9 - 12 p.m.	6	10
8:30 - 11 or 11:30 p.m.	6	10
10:30 a.m. - 2 p.m.	2	3
10:00 a.m. - 3 p.m.	1	2
1 p.m. - 3 p.m.	1	2
1 p.m. - 4 p.m.	2	3
12 noon - 3 p.m.	1	2
Total	62	101[b]

[a] Information provided by unit chairmen.

[b] Adds to more than 100 because of rounding.

Physical and Mental State of Women at Time of Meetings

In general, the women who reported on their physical and mental state at the time of their meetings were either average or above (Table 44). A considerably larger percent (49) said they were mentally alert than said they felt real energetic (27 percent). Only those women whose units met in the evening had a noticeable percent (10) who claimed they felt pretty tired. The number who felt below normal in alertness was only six, and these were women whose groups met in the evening.

Estimated Average Number of Hours Devoted to Unit Meetings

For the 61 units reporting, the mean for the estimated average number of hours which a unit met was 3.0 (Table 45). Slightly over three fourths (76 percent) of the 61 units met for three or more hours. Ten percent had average meetings which lasted from four to six hours. Only four of the units met for two hours.

Table 43

Number and Percentage Distribution of Units According to Meeting Places[a]

Places units met	Units Number	 Percent
Houses of members	47	75.8
Houses and churches	3	4.8
Churches	2	3.2
Houses and schools	2	3.2
Houses and auditorium in public housing	1	1.6
Houses and bank building	1	1.6
Houses and fire hall	1	1.6
Houses and lodge hall	1	1.6
Houses, church, and fire house	1	1.6
School and church	1	1.6
Municipal building	1	1.6
YMCA	1	1.6
Total	62	99.8[b]

[a] Information provided by unit chairmen.

[b] Does not add to 100 because of rounding.

Estimated Average Number of Hours of Unit Meetings Devoted to Project Lessons

For the 60 units reporting, the mean estimated average number of hours devoted to project lessons was 2.1 (Table 46). Almost one third (32 percent) of the 60 units devoted from 2.5 to five hours to their project lessons. Only five, or eight percent, of the 60 units gave less than 1.5 hours to their project lessons.

Table 44

Number and Percentage Distribution of Unit Members According to Physical and Mental State and Time of Day at Which Units Met

Physical and mental state	Morning meeting (2 units)		Afternoon meeting (5 units)		Evening meeting (55 units)		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Physical state								
Felt real energetic	12	44	31	50	215	25	258	27
Felt above average	15	56	29	48	565	65	609	64
Felt pretty tired	0	0	1	2	82	10	83	9
Total	27	100	61	100	862[a]	100	950	100
Mental state								
Felt alert	18	67	47	77	405	47	470	49
Felt moderately alert	9	33	14	23	452	52	475	50
Felt below normal in alertness	0	0	0	0	6	1	6	1
Total	27	100	61	100	863	100	951	100

[a] One member who gave information on mental state did not do so for physical state.

Table 45

Number and Percentage Distribution of Units According to Estimated Average Number of Hours Devoted to Unit Meetings[a]

Estimated average number of hours devoted to unit meetings	Units: Number	Units: Percent
2.0	4	6
2.5	10	16
2.8	1	2
3.0	34	56
3.5	6	10
4.0	4	6
5.0	1	2
6.0	1	2
Total	61	100
Mean	3.0	

$\sigma = \pm .6$
CV = 20%

---

[a] Information provided by unit chairmen.

Table 46

Number and Percentage Distribution of Units According to Estimated Average Number of Hours Devoted to Project Lessons[a]

Estimated average number of hours devoted to project lessons		Units	
		Number	Percent
1.0		4	6
1.3		1	2
1.5		14	23
2.0		22	37
2.5		12	20
3.0		4	6
4.0		1	2
4.5		1	2
5.0		1	2
	Total	60	100
	Mean	2.1	

$\sigma = \pm.75$
CV = 36%

---

[a] Information provided by unit chairmen.

Percent of Total Meeting Time Devoted to Project Lessons

The estimated average amount of time devoted to project lessons as given by each unit chairman was divided by the total estimated average amount of time devoted to unit meetings as reported by the same chairman and multiplied by 100 to obtain the percentages used here.

The mean percent of total meeting time devoted to project lessons for the 59 units reporting was 67.2 (Table 47). Thus, on the average, about two thirds of the meeting time of units was used for project teaching. A little over one third (37 percent) of the units devoted an estimated 75 percent or more of their meeting time to project teaching. Only nine percent of the 60 units devoted less than half of their meeting time to project teaching. It is recognized that the data presented here were estimates given by the chairmen of the units. Even so, these chairmen thought their units devoted a fairly large part of their meeting time to teaching.

Table 47

Number and Percentage Distribution of Units According to Percent of Total Meeting Time Devoted to Project Lessons[a]

Percent of total meeting time devoted to project lessons	Units: Number	Units: Percent
33	1	2
40	3	5
43	1	2
50	9	15
55	1	2
57	1	2
60	2	3
67	16	27
71	3	5
75	6	10
80	4	7
83	9	15
86	1	2
100	2	3
Total	59	100
Mean	67.2	

σ = ±6.9
CV = 10%

---

[a] Based on estimated average number of hours of total meeting and estimated average number of hours of meeting devoted to project lessons; information provided by unit chairmen.

Late Comers for Project Lessons

Any volunteer group engaged in educational or other kinds of activities is likely to have laggards. The chairmen of 60 units gave an estimated percent of members who were late for project lessons. The mean for the 60 units was 9.5 percent (Table 48). Forty-three percent of the units, according to their chairmen, had no late comers. This is probably an overoptimistic view, but apparently a goodly number of the chairmen thought this was true or, at least, that lateness of arrival of members was not serious. Eleven percent of the units, however, must have experienced difficulties with regard to late comers, because these units were reported as having from 25 to 100 percent of their members appearing late for project lessons.

Table 48

Number and Percentage Distribution of Units According to Estimated Percent of Unit Members Who Usually Came in Late for Project Lessons[a]

Estimated percent of members who usually came in late for project lessons		Units	
		Number	Percent
0		26	43
1		8	13
2		6	10
4		1	2
5		2	3
9		1	2
10		4	7
15		1	2
20		5	8
25		1	2
50		3	5
95		1	2
100		1	2
	Total	60	101[b]
	Mean	9.5	

$\sigma = \pm 20.2$
CV = 213%

---

[a] Information provided by unit chairmen.

[b] Adds to more than 100 because of rounding.

Sources of Homemaking Information

Table 49 presents the 62 units according to percent of members who made much use of each of four extension sources of homemaking information. The highest average (mean) for the 62 units was 57.8 percent for home demonstration units, followed by monthly newsletters (35.5 percent), Cornell bulletins (32.6 percent) and TV programs of Home Economics Division and/or on homemaking[1] (3.8 percent). The small extent to which TV programs were made much use of is noteworthy.

If the members are considered irrespective of unit connections, the following is the array from highest to lowest of 13 specific sources of information according to the percent of members who made much use of each:

Source of homemaking information	Percent who made much use of
Home demonstration unit (N=992)	58
Newspaper articles (N=1,019)	56
Magazine articles (N=1,019)	54
Monthly newsletter of Home Ec. Division (N=1,003)	35
Cornell bulletins (N=1,014)	32
Advertisements in newspapers and magazines (N=1,019)	18
Bulletins from other universities (N=1,018)	11
Advertisements over radio and TV (N=1,019)	7
Publications of industrial concerns (N=1,017)	7
Personal contacts with HE agents (visit with or telephone) (N=1,015)	5

---

[1] It is quite possible that some of the TV homemaking programs were not extension programs. For the total membership studied, this category of TV programs was much used by only a small percent of the members, but a percent that was slightly larger than for TV programs by the Home Economics Division. Some members checked the same extent of use of both classes of programs.

Sources of homemaking information	Percent who made much use of
Radio programs on homemaking (N=1,019)	4
Television programs on homemaking (N=1,019)	3[1]
Television programs of Home Ec. Division (N=1,019)	2[1]

It is quite possible that the interviewing of the unit members tended to focus their attention on the unit as a source of information. Even so, its relatively high rank is noteworthy. The next ranking extension source of information was the monthly newsletter of the Home Ec. Division with 35 percent who made much use of, followed closely by Cornell bulletins with 32 percent. However, among the 13 sources listed in the tabulation, newspaper articles ranked second with 56 percent who made much use of, followed closely by magazine articles with 54 percent. It is quite possible, of course, that some of the newspaper articles were prepared by the county home economics agents.

Relationship of HD Units to College of Home Economics

The relationship of the HD units to the College of Home Economics, particularly its extension staff, had from time to time been a matter for serious discussion. Since this study offered an opportunity for interviewing HD unit members in some detail, it was felt that the relationship of the units to the college should be explored. Accordingly, interviewees were asked to respond to the following item:

> The purpose of the Cooperative Extension Service is in cooperation with Cornell University to extend to the people of the state the educational programs of the New York State Colleges of Agriculture and Home Economics. The College of Home Economics has primary responsibility for educational work with the county home demonstration departments and the HD units. Will you indicate how you

---

[1] If these two sources are combined so that anyone who checked one or both is counted only once, the percent is four.

feel about this relationship of the College of Home Economics to home demonstration work in this county by indicating your opinion regarding the following:

1) It is necessary for the college to take leadership in working with the county to determine subject matter offered.

   ____ agree; ____ partially agree; ____ disagree;

   ____ don't know

2) It is desirable for the college to set standards for what is taught.

   ____ agree; ____ partially agree; ____ disagree;

   ____ don't know

3) The college through its specialists provides good training for our project leaders.

   ____ agree; ____ partially agree; ____ disagree;

   ____ don't know

4) The college through the training given the home demonstration agents provides good training for our project leaders.

   ____ agree; ____ partially agree; ____ disagree;

   ____ don't know

It was early recognized that the third item was too remote for many of the women to react to in a realistic manner. This point of view was further supported by the fact that 294 of the women responded with don't know. Therefore, in developing a score for the members' views of the relationship of the College of Home Economics to county home demonstration work, statements 1, 2, and 4 were used with 3 being omitted. The forced answers to the statements were given the following values: agree--3, partially agree--2, disagree--1, and don't know--0. An individual's score was the sum of the values indicated by the answers checked. The maximum possible score was nine.

The average unit had a mean score for relationship to the College of Home Economics of 6.6, which was 73 percent of the maximum possible score of nine (Table 50). A large percent of the units had means that clustered around the average unit.

Table 49

Number and Percentage Distribution of Units According to Percentages of Unit Members Who Made Much Use of Four Extension Sources of Information

Percent of unit members who made much use of	Cornell bulletins		HD units		Monthly newsletter		TV programs of Home Ec. Div. and/or on homemaking	
	No. of units	Percent of units	No. of units	Percent of units	No. of units	Percent of units	No. of units	Percent of units
0	3	5	0	0	1	2	36	58
1 - 9	1	2	1	2	1	2	17	27
10 - 19	15	24	0	0	6	10	7	11
20 - 29	10	16	6	10	19	30	1	2
30 - 39	13	21	4	6	15	24	1	2
40 - 49	8	13	8	13	10	16	0	0
50 - 59	4	6	12	19	6	10	0	0
60 - 69	6	10	14	22	0	0	0	0
70 - 79	2	3	6	10	4	6	0	0
80 - 89	0	0	8	13	0	0	0	0
90 - 99	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0
100	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0
Total	62	100	62	100	62	100	62	100
Mean	32.6		57.8		35.5		3.8	
σ =	±18.6		±20.1		±15.9		±5.9	
CV =	57%		35%		45%		155%	

Thus, 24 percent of the units had means that fell in the category 5.0 - 5.9; 41 percent had means in the category 6.0 - 6.9; and 26 percent had means in the category 7.0 - 7.9.

Table 50

Number and Percentage Distribution of Units According to Mean Scores on Relationship to College of Home Economics

Mean scores on relationship to College of Home Economics		Units	
		Number	Percent
4.0 - 4.9		2	3
5.0 - 5.9		15	24
6.0 - 6.9		25	41
7.0 - 7.9		16	26
8.0 - 8.9		4	6
9.0		0	0
	Total	62	100
	Mean of means	6.6	

σ = ±.9
CV = 13%

When individual members are considered irrespective of units, 236, or 23 percent, of the 1,018 who provided data attained a perfect score of nine. For no other score was there such a large number of women. Only 27 percent of the women had scores of five or less.

For statements 1, 2, and 4, the percent of members who fully agreed was calculated for each unit and the mean percent for the 62 units obtained. This mean for the 62 units for each of the statements follows:

Statements	Mean percentages of members who fully agreed for 62 units
1. It is necessary for the college to take leadership in work with county to determine subject matter offered	39

Statements	Mean percentages of members who fully agreed for 62 units
2. It is desirable for the college to set standards for what is taught.	48
4. The college through the training given the home demonstration agents provides good training for our project leaders	74

From these percentages, it appears that the unit members had reservations regarding the college's leadership in determining subject-matter offerings with only a mean percent of 39 for the 62 units. The members of the units were more willing for the college to set standards for what was taught, the mean percent *fully agreeing* for the 62 units being 48. The women certainly thought training given their agents for training project leaders was good, with the mean percent of those *fully agreeing* being 74 for the 62 units.

Evaluation of Teaching of the Floor Facts Project

As originally designed, a major objective of this study was to relate the measurement of the effects of the teaching of a specific project to the characteristics of the units. The lesson, *Floor Facts*, was a one session lesson taught by project leaders who had been trained by an Onondaga home economics agent. Sixty-two units had indicated that they would participate in the project. However, the lesson was taught in only 56 of the 62 units. Fifty-five leaders did the teaching, one leader having taught two units. While lesson reports by the leaders were obtained from the 56 units, usable pre- and post-tests on the lesson for the same individuals were obtained from only 48 units and two of these were dropped from the data because in one case only two members took both tests and in the other, information on characteristics was available for only two of the four members who took both tests.

Measurement of Effects of the Project Teaching

The average unit had a mean pre-test score of 10.9 (Table 51). The maximum possible score on the test was 21.0. Thus, the average unit's membership attained a mean on the pre-test that was approximately half of the maximum possible score. Only a few units had excessively low scores or excessively high ones. The actual range was from 6.0 to 14.0.

Table 51

Number and Percentage Distribution of Units According to Mean Pre-Test Scores for the Floor Facts Lesson

		Units	
Mean pre-test scores		Number	Percent
6.0 - 6.9		1	2
7.0 - 7.9		0	0
8.0 - 8.9		3	7
9.0 - 9.9		7	15
10.0 - 10.9		12	26
11.0 - 11.9		12	26
12.0 - 12.9		8	18
13.0 - 13.9		2	4
14.0 - 14.9		1	2
	Total	46[a]	100
	Mean of means	10.9[b]	

$\sigma = \pm 1.5$
CV = 14%

[a] These are the units whose attending members took pre- and post-tests on the Floor Facts lesson excluding two units that had only two members who took the tests and on whom characteristic information was available.

[b] Maximum possible score was 21.0.

If the unit members are considered as a whole, the range on the pre-test was from 0 to 21. Two women achieved perfect scores of 21. Slightly over three fourths (76.3 percent) of the 413 members from whom both usable pre- and post-tests from the same persons were obtained scored from 7 to 14 points out of the maximum possible of 21.

The average unit had a mean post-test score of 16.0 (Table 52).[1] Thus, the members of the average unit attained a mean score that was five points short of the maximum possible of 21. Only a few units had excessively low or excessively high scores. The actual range was from 13.0 to 19.5. Thus, the lowest post-test mean was slightly below the highest pre-test mean.

When the unit members are considered as a whole, the range of scores on the post-test for the 413 members was from 2 to 21. Nine women had perfect scores of 21. Slightly over one third (34.0 percent) of the members had scores from 18 to 21.

Table 53 gives a distribution of the 46 units according to mean differences between the means of pre- and post-test scores of units. The average unit showed a mean gain of 5.1 which was significant at .0005 (one-tail) level. Forty-eight percent of the units had mean gains which were between 4.0 and 5.9 points. Only 13 percent of the units had mean gains under 3.0 points. However, 30 percent had mean gains from 6.0 to 8.9. The unit means ranged from an actual mean gain of 2.0 to 8.8.

Only 3.9 percent of the 413 women taking both pre- and post-tests showed a decline in their post-test compared to their pre-test score, 4.6 percent had no gain, but 91.5 percent showed gains. Those who gained from 10 to 18 points constituted 12.8 percent of the total.

---

[1] The post-test was identical with the pre-test. The latter was given before the lesson was taught and the former immediately after.

Table 52

Number and Percentage Distribution of Units According to Mean Post-Test Scores for the Floor Facts Lesson

Mean post-test scores		Units Number	Units Percent
13.0 - 13.9		3	7
14.0 - 14.9		8	17
15.0 - 15.9		10	22
16.0 - 16.9		15	32
17.0 - 17.9		7	15
18.0 - 18.9		0	0
19.0 - 19.9		3	7
	Total	46[a]	100
	Mean of means	16.0[b]	

$\sigma = \pm 1.4$
CV = 9%

---

[a] These are the units whose members took pre- and post-tests on the Floor Facts Lesson excluding two units that had only two members who took the tests and on whom characteristic information was available.

[b] Maximum possible score was 21.

Relationship of Unit Characteristics to Learning of Members Participating in Floor Facts Project

It is recognized that there are limitations in examining the relationship between unit characteristics as indexed by means and the learning similarly indexed that occurred on the part of members of units participating in only one lesson. Exploring these relationships, however, was an important purpose of the study, stimulated by critical comments frequently encountered regarding the influence on learning of the characteristics of the units. These unit characteristics were divided into two classes, i.e., 1) characteristics of units as derived from personal characteristics of members, and 2) characteristics of units derived from members' connections with the units.

Table 53

Number and Percentage Distribution of Units According to Mean Differences of the Mean Pre- and Post-Test Scores of Units for the Floor Facts Lesson

Mean differences of mean pre- and post-test scores of units	Units	
	Number	Percent
2.0 - 2.9	6	13
3.0 - 3.9	4	9
4.0 - 4.9	11	24
5.0 - 5.9	11	24
6.0 - 6.9	10	22
7.0 - 7.9	2	4
8.0 - 8.9	2	4
Total	46[a]	100
Mean of means	5.1	

$\sigma = \pm 1.6$

CV = 31%

P for t of mean difference of the means of the pre- and post-test scores of the units for the Floor Facts lesson < .0005 (one-tail).

---

[a] These are the units whose attending members took both pre- and post-tests on the Floor Facts lesson excluding two units that had only two members who took the tests and on whom characteristic information was available.

The procedure used in this analysis of relationships was to calculate the mean of the mean differences of unit members on pre- and post-tests of the subject matter of the Floor Facts lesson for two classes of units, i.e., those with high and with low mean numbers of members, scores, percentages, etc. A *t* test was calculated for the mean differences of the pre- and post-test and its probability level ascertained. The significance level accepted was .05. For relationships where the *t* for the difference on the pre-test means between high and low scores on the Floor Facts knowledge test had a P for *t* of .20 or less, covariance analysis was used to determine the significance of the mean differences. The covariance analysis was considered necessary to take care of initial differences that were significant or nearly significant at .05.[1]

Relationship of Learning to Characteristics of Unit as Derived From Personal Characteristics of Members[2]

The unit characteristics listed below were tested for significance of relationship to the learning of the members. Indication is given as to whether or not the relationship was significant at .05.

Percent of members living in rural places	NS
Age of members	NS
Years of school completed by members	NS
Number of courses taken in home economics by members	NS
Number in family of members	NS
Percent of unit members whose husbands were in professional, technical, and kindred types of occupations	NS
Percent of unit members employed	NS
Participation score of members	S
Net income of members	NS

Of the nine characteristics only one showed a significant relationship and that one was participation score of members. The units with low mean participation scores on the average had a larger mean gain on their test scores than units with high mean participation scores.

---

[1] Forty-six units were used in this analysis. The units included were those which had both pre- and post-tests for the same individuals, had these tests for more than two persons, and had interview schedules for the individuals for whom the tests were available.

[2] See Appendix E for tables presenting detailed data on these relationships.

Relationship of Learning to Characteristics of Units as Derived From Members' Connections with the Units

The unit characteristics listed below were tested for significance of relationship to the learning of the members. No relationship was found significant at .05.

Number of members in units
Number of years unit has existed
Number of years of membership of members
Number of leadership positions held by members
Percent of membership years devoted to leadership
Percent of average meeting time spent on project lessons
Reaction of members to project teaching
Friendship percent score among members
Close friendship of members
Percent of members visited with one or more times by each member
Relationship score of members to College of Home Economics

Floor Facts Project Leaders

Comparison of Floor Facts Project Leaders with Members of Units

In this section the project leaders who expected to teach the Floor Facts lesson, those who taught the lesson, and those whose units had usable pre- and post-tests on the lesson from the same individuals are compared to all members (excluding 55 project leaders) of the 62 units on six selected characteristics.[1] On four of these characteristics, i.e., 1) mean number of home economics courses of any kind taken (except those taken through Extension), 2) mean organizational participation score, 3) mean friendship percent score, and 4) mean number of years of membership in unit to which now belong, as would be expected from their overlapping, all (55) Floor Facts Project leaders and those project leaders (43) whose units had usable pre- and post-tests for the same individuals were quite similar (Table 54).

---

[1] All unit members refers to all members who were interviewed. Eighty-six of the unit members exclusive of the 55 leaders were not interviewed. Among these 86 were two Floor Facts Project leaders who were not interviewed. There was a total of 57 Floor Facts leaders.

All (966) members of the 62 units (excluding 55 project leaders) and the 55 Floor Facts Project leaders differed significantly ($P < .05$) on their mean organizational participation score, with the project leaders having a higher mean score, and also on mean friendship percent score, with the leaders having a higher mean score. Likewise, as would be expected in view of their similarity to the 55 project leaders, the 43 Floor Facts Project leaders whose units had usable pre- and post-tests from the same individuals also differed from all members significantly ($P < .05$) on both of these characteristics, with the leaders having a higher score in each case. The 43 Floor Facts Project leaders, while quite similar to the 55 Floor Facts Project leaders on the number of home economics courses taken other than those taken through Extension, were not so closely similar as for the other three characteristics, so that the 43 Floor Facts Project leaders differed significantly ($P < .05$) from all members on this item with the leaders having a higher mean number of courses. The 55 Floor Facts leaders did not differ significantly from all members on the item. There were no significant differences between the means of either leader group and all members for number of years of membership in unit to which belonged.

Since average age and average years of school completed for the three groups were medians,[1] it was not possible to test the significance of the differences between the groups for these

---

[1] Following the practice of the U. S. Census, medians were used for age and years of school completed. Although the age and school data were obtained by class intervals, it would have been possible to calculate means for both classes of data.

Table 54

Comparison on Selected Characteristics of All Members (Exclusive of 55 Project Leaders) in the 62 Units With All (55) Floor Facts Project Leaders and with Floor Facts Project Leaders (43) Whose Units Had Usable Pre- and Post-Tests from the Same Participants

Characteristics	(1) All members exclusive of 55 Floor Facts Project leaders (N=966)[a]	(2) All Floor Facts Project leaders (N=55)[b]	(3) Floor Facts Project leaders whose units had usable pre- and post-tests from the same individuals (N=43)[c]
(1) Mean number of home economics courses taken exclusive of extension projects	2.4	3.2	3.8
(2) Mean organizational participation score	7.5	10.0	10.1
(3) Mean friendship percent score in unit to which belonged	55.2	64.4	64.0
(4) Mean number of years of membership in unit to which belonged	4.2	5.1	5.4
(5) Median age	34.8	33.8	33.4
(6) Median years of school completed	12.4	13.2	12.9

---

[a] The number of no information cases for the six items ranged from none to four.

[b] The number of no information cases for the six items ranged from none to one. Fifty-seven project leaders were trained to teach the Floor Facts lesson but two of them were not interviewed and hence no characteristic data were available for these two.

[c] The number of no information cases for the six items ranged from none to one. Two leaders from whose units usable pre- and post-tests and schedules for only two members were obtained were excluded; two leaders whose units had both pre- and post-tests for the same members were not interviewed, and 10 leaders who were trained, did not teach the project. The 43 leaders (plus the two excluded here because no data on characteristics were available) were those who taught the 46 units used in the analysis of the effects of teaching the Floor Facts Project.

	(Two-tail)	
P for t of mean difference row (1), columns (1) and (2).	<.20	
P for t of mean difference row (1), columns (1) and (3).	<.02	(S)
P for t of mean difference row (1), columns (2) and (3).	<.60	
P for t of mean difference row (2), columns (1) and (2).	<.001	(S)
P for t of mean difference row (2), columns (1) and (3).	<.01	(S)
P for t of mean difference row (2), columns (2) and (3).	<1.00	
P for t of mean difference row (3), columns (1) and (2).	<.001	(S)
P for t of mean difference row (3), columns (1) and (3).	<.01	(S)
P for t of mean difference row (3), columns (2) and (3).	<.90	
P for t of mean difference row (4), columns (1) and (2).	<.30	
P for t of mean difference row (4), columns (1) and (3).	<.20	
P for t of mean difference row (4), columns (2) and (3).	<.80	

averages. However, the median ages and median number of years of school completed were fairly similar for the three groups. The project leaders were slightly younger and had a bit more formal education than did all members exclusive of the project leaders.

Preparation of Floor Facts Project Leaders for Teaching

Pre- and post-test scores on knowledge of Floor Facts material.

The home economics agent who trained the project leaders for the Floor Facts Project gave them pre- and post-tests as a part of their training. The two groups of project leaders, i.e., all 57 trainees and the 45 who actually taught the project and whose units returned usable pre- and post-tests from the same members, were very similar on their pre-test mean scores, and, while the two groups were not significantly different on the pre-test from the 413 members who took the test, they resembled the women who were to be taught less than they did each other (Table 55).[1] There were no significant differences among the three groups on their mean post-test scores, nor on the differences of the differences between pre- and post-test means (difference in gains from pre- and post-test between each group). However, both groups of the Floor Facts Project leaders made significant gains in the mean differences between their pre- and post-test scores. The same was true for the 413 members.

---

[1] This similarity among the three groups on the pre-test provides a somewhat comparable base for testing differences on the post-test.

Time spent in preparation. Forty-six project leaders from whose units usable pre- and post-tests were obtained indicated in their lesson reports the number of hours they spent in teaching preparation in addition to their training by the home economics agent.[1] The tabulation below gives the percentage distribution of the 46 leaders whose units had usable pre- and post-tests from the same individuals according to hours of preparation:

Number of hours of preparation	Percent (N=46)
One hour or less	30.4
Two hours	30.4
Three or more hours	39.1
Total	99.9[2]

Three tenths of the leaders spent only an hour or less; but 70 percent spent two or more hours.

The units were distributed according to the three categories of the leaders' preparation, and the differences between the mean differences of the pre- and post-test mean scores of units in the three categories were tested for significance. None of the tests was significant at .05 or less. In fact, the means of the differences between the pre- and post-test mean scores for the units in the various categories were very similar. Examination of the differences in the mean pre-test scores for the units in the three categories indicates that these pre-test means were similar enough to warrant acceptance of the matched character of the three classes of units on the pre-test and hence to justify acceptance of the testing of the mean differences.

---

[1] One leader who taught two units is counted twice because she reported on both units. There was no information on this item for two units.

[2] Does not add to 100 because of rounding.

Table 55

Comparison on Test Scores of All Members Participating in Floor Facts Project and Taking Both Pre- and Post-Tests with All (57) Floor Facts Project Leaders and with the Floor Facts Project Leaders (45) Whose Units Had Usable Pre- and Post-Tests from the Same Individuals

Scores, ranges, & differences	(1) All women participating in Floor Facts Project and taking pre- and post-tests (N=413)[a]	(2) All Floor Facts Project leaders (N=57)[b]	(3) Floor Facts Project leaders whose units had usable pre- and post-tests from the same individuals[b] (N=45)
1. Pre-test mean scores	10.9	11.6	11.8
2. Pre-test range of scores	0 to 21	5 to 17	5 to 17
3. Post-test mean scores	16.1	16.5	16.7
4. Post-test range of scores	2 to 21	11 to 21	11 to 21
5. Difference between pre- and post-test means	5.2	4.9	4.9
6. Range of differences between pre- and post-test scores	-9 to +18	+1 to +11	+1 to +11

[a] All members having both pre- and post-tests were included without regard to whether or not an interview schedule was obtained. Characteristics of members were not required at this point.

[b] Includes two leaders who took tests but were not subsequently interviewed. Characteristics on leaders were not required at this point. The 45 project leaders for whom data are presented in column 3 are those who taught the 46 units used in measuring the effects of teaching the Floor Facts Project.

	Two-tail
P for t of mean difference row (1), columns (1) and (2)	<.20
P for t of mean difference row (1), columns (1) and (3)	<.10
P for t of mean difference row (1), columns (2) and (3)	<.80
P for t of mean difference row (3), columns (1) and (2)	<.30
P for t of mean difference row (3), columns (1) and (3)	<.20
P for t of mean difference row (3), columns (2) and (3)	<.70
P for t of mean difference row (5), columns (1) and (2)	<.60
P for t of mean difference row (5), columns (1) and (3)	<.60
P for t of mean difference row (5), columns (2) and (3)	Identical means
P for t of mean difference between pre- and post-test row (5), column (1)	<.0005 (one-tail)
P for t of mean difference between pre- and post-test row (5), column (2)	<.0005 (one-tail)
P for t of mean difference between pre- and post-test row (5), column (3)	<.0005 (one-tail)

Number of Hours Spent Teaching Floor Facts Project

The project leaders were distributed as follows for hours spent teaching the Floor Facts Project:

Number of hours	Percent[1] (N=46)
1.0 - 1.5 hours	38
1.5 or more hours	62
Total	100

Almost two thirds of the leaders spent 1.5 or more hours teaching the Floor Facts Project.

The units were divided according to the two categories of hours spent on teaching the Floor Facts Project and the difference between the mean differences of the pre- and post-test mean scores of the units in the two categories were tested for significance. The test showed no significance at .05 or less. When tested, the difference between the means of the mean pre-test scores of the two groups of units was found to be sufficiently nonsignificant to warrant acceptance of the matched character of the two groups of units on the pre-test and hence to justify acceptance of the testing of the mean differences.

Leaders' Evaluation of Teaching of Floor Facts Project

Of the 47 leaders[2] who reported, 72 percent were satisfied with their teaching experience and 28 percent partially satisfied. However, when the units were divided into the two categories of satisfied leaders and partially satisfied leaders, no significant difference was found in the gains from the pre- to post-test of the members of the two classes of units. The two groups of units were considered similar enough on their pre-tests to warrant comparing them on their gains in scores from the pre- to post-test.

---

[1] One leader who taught two units is counted twice because she reported on both units. There was no information on this item for two units.

[2] One leader who taught two units is counted twice. There was no information on this item for one unit.

Coverage of Topics in Teaching the Floor Facts Project[1]

The Floor Facts Project consisted of eight major topics. Forty-five percent of the 47 leaders reporting[2] indicated that all eight topics were covered. The percent of the 47 leaders covering each of the eight major topics is given in the following tabulation:

Major topics	Percent (N=47)
Types of waxes	100
Hard floors	98
Resilient floors	98
Care factors	94
Selection factors	89
Grade	77
Use of equipment	68
Underlayments	64

According to this record, the leaders evidently thought they had done a fairly good job in terms of coverage of the content of the project.

Use of Teaching Aids for the Floor Facts Project

Forty-six of the leaders[2] reporting indicated the major teaching aids that they used. The percent of the 46 leaders using each major aid is given below:

---

[1] No attempt was made to relate the findings of this and the succeeding topic to the learning of unit members on the Floor Facts Project.

[2] One leader who taught two units is counted twice. There was no information on this item for one unit.

Major aid	Percent (N=47)
Floor Facts kit	98
Leaders' Guide	98
Facts About Floor Care (bulletin)	81
Magazine pictures	72

These percentages certainly indicate that most of the leaders made use of the major aids that were given them or called to their attention by the home economics agent.

Supplement--Variations Around Central Tendencies

Since major emphasis of this study has been on the unit, which has frequently meant that some measure of central tendency (mean or median) has been used to characterize units or describe some aspect of their functions (activities), it was thought that attention should be given to variations of unit values around these measures of central tendency (means or medians) for the various variables. Accordingly, for all means and medians as well as means of means or means of medians whether the unit of analysis was the unit (club) or individual members, standard deviations in the case of means and in the case of medians semi-interquartile values (Q) were calculated along with coefficients of variation (CV).[1]

The coefficients of variation were considered the critical indices for judgments as to whether or not the mean or medians of variables used for characterizing units or describing activities related to them could be accepted as indices of these characteristics and descriptions for a large proportion of the units. Since the coefficient of variation indicates the relative size of a standard deviation to its mean, this percentage figure has been used to indicate in a general way those variables used in the study whose means seemed to index the units effectively. To do this certain arbitrary decisions were made. Thus, it was decided that a mean with a coefficient of variation under 40 would be considered as an adequate index of units for a given variable. In the case of unit means used to calculate a mean of means, it was decided that the mean of any variable for which 53 percent[2] of the units had coefficients of variation under 40 would be considered an adequate index. This under 40 percent level of the coefficient of variation means that about two thirds of the distribution, assuming normality, would fall between -16 to +16 with the ± σ being 39 percent or less of its mean.[1] The 53 percent-of-units level is arbitrary and based on the author's best judgment.

---

[1] Although not customarily done, the percentages which the semi-interquartile values were of their respective medians have been calculated and classified under coefficient of variation. Actually, there were only a few instances where the measure of central tendency was a median.

[2] Fifty-three was chosen as it was the closest percent to 50.

In using the coefficient of variation in the arbitrary and rather rigid manner described above, it is recognized that the magnitude of the base used in calculating the coefficient has been ignored. Whether a coefficient of variation of 40 percent for size of family which is usually a fairly small figure can be considered equal to 40 percent for age which in the case of adults is a much larger figure, is subject to question.[2]

Table 56 lists all of the mean indices of variables (with accompanying table numbers) used in the study wherever a measure of central tendency with the HD unit (club) as the unit of analysis was given. These measures of central tendency were mean, mean of means, and mean of medians. The mean for the variable is given along with the coefficient of variation, and indications of whether the coefficient is under 40 percent. Of the 42 mean indices of variables listed, 22 had coefficients of variation which were under 40 percent. The variables having these indices are:

---

[1] In the case of the medians 50 percent of the distribution would fall between -Q and +Q with ±Q being 39 percent or less of its median.

[2] It is recognized that the application of the coefficient of variation to measurement scales is acceptable to statisticians only when the scale is one of equal units and when the absolute zero point is taken into account. Insofar as it could be judged, it appears that these criteria were frequently met by the means (or medians) used in the study. However, there was some question about this in some instances. It was thought, however, that using the coefficients served a useful purpose even though the criteria for their use sometimes had to be disregarded.

1. Years of age
2. Years of school completed
3. Number in family
4. Number in household
5. Participation score
6. Rating unit high or very high
7. Number of members in unit
8. Friendship percent score
9. Motive for belonging to unit--wanting to learn
10. Motive for belonging to unit--wanting to enjoy social life
11. Number of extension projects in which participated
12. Score on reaction to project teaching
13. Percent of unit members learned something applied
14. Percent of unit members who thought planning meetings useful
15. Number of hours unit devoted to meetings
16. Number of hours unit devoted to project lessons
17. Percent of total meeting time of unit devoted to project lessons
18. Percent of unit members making use of HD unit for information
19. Score on relationship to College of Home Economics
20. Pre-test score on Floor Facts lesson
21. Post-test score on Floor Facts lesson
22. Difference between pre- and post-test scores

Thus, according to our criterion, 22 of the 42 variables relative to unit characteristics or descriptions as presented in the tables of the text are adequately represented by the measures of central tendency which appear in the tables.

Table 56

Coefficients of Variation for Means of Variables Presented in Tables of Text

Mean Indices of variables	Means	CV	CV under 40 percent
1. Mean of median age, Table 2*	37.4	25	X
2. Mean of median years of school completed, Table 3*	12.9	9	X
3. Mean of mean number of H. E. courses taken exclusive of HD projects, Table 4*	2.4	44	
4. Mean of mean numbers in families, Table 5*	4.1	20	X
5. Mean of mean numbers in household, Table 6*	4.3	19	X
6. Mean percent of members employed, Table 8	31.3	48	
7. Mean percent of members employed full- or part-time by someone, Table 9	25.2	50	
8. Mean percent of members self-employed full- or part-time, Table 10	7.8	100	
9. Mean of mean participation scores, Table 11*	7.9	30	X
10. Mean percent of members rating unit very high and high, Table 12	63.1	36	X
11. Mean number of members in unit, Table 14	17.9	39	X
12. Mean of mean number of years of unit membership, Table 15*	4.5	89	
13. Mean number of years units have existed, Table 16	9.4	83	
14. Mean of mean friendship percent scores, Table 17*	58.2	20	X
15. Mean of mean percentages of unit members claimed as close friends, Table 18*	22.1	49	
16. Mean of mean percentages of unit members known very little, Table 19*	23.1	42	
17. Mean of mean percentages of unit members not known, Table 20*	12.0	87	
18. Mean of mean percentages of members visited by different members one or more times in past three months, Table 21*	24.7	55	
19. Mean percent of unit members belonging because wanted to learn best ways to run household, Table 23	93.9	8	X
20. Mean percent of unit members belonging because they enjoyed social life of unit, Table 24	81.7	16 16	X
21. Mean of mean numbers of different unit leadership positions held, Table 26*	1.9	53	
22. Mean percent of unit members never holding leadership position, Table 27	33.9	58	

23.	Mean of mean percentages of leadership years of unit members, Table 30*	59.4	42	
24.	Mean percent of unit members saying project leaders difficult to find, Table 31	35.6	80	
25.	Mean of mean numbers of extension projects unit members participated in (1964-65), Table 33*	4.95	4	X
26.	Mean of mean scores on reaction to project teaching, Table 34*	3.7	24	X
27.	Mean percent of unit members who learned something applied, Table 36	86.0	15	X
28.	Mean percent of members responding who thought program planning meeting useful, Table 40	88.9	11	X
29.	Mean number of times units met (1964-65), Table 41	18.0	48	
30.	Mean number of times units planned to meet (1964-65), Table 41	17.7	46	
31.	Mean estimated average number of hours units devoted to meetings, Table 45	3.0	20	X
32.	Mean estimated average number of hours units devoted to project lessons, Table 46	2.1	36	X
33.	Mean percent of total meeting time of units devoted to project lessons, Table 47	67.2	10	X
34.	Mean estimated percent of unit members who usually came in late for project lessons, Table 48	9.5	213	
35.	Mean percent of unit members making much use of Cornell bulletins for information, Table 49	32.6	57	
36.	Mean percent of unit members making much use of HD units for information, Table 49	57.8	35	X
37.	Mean percent of unit members making much use of monthly newletters for information, Table 49	35.5	45	
38.	Mean percent of unit members making much use of TV programs (HD or on homemaking) for information, Table 49	3.8	155	
39.	Mean of mean scores on relationship to College of Home Economics, Table 50*	6.6	13	X
40.	Mean of mean scores on pre-test for Floor Facts lesson, Table 51*	10.9	14	X
41.	Mean of mean scores on post-test for Floor Facts lesson, Table 52*	16.0	9	X
42.	Mean of mean differences between pre- and post-tests for Floor Facts lesson, Table 53*	5.1	31	X

---

[*] The asterisks are used to call attention to those indices of variables which are either means of means or means of medians. These indices of variables are again listed in Table 57.

However, to refine still further the use of central tendencies which were used in preparing the textual tables, consideration needs to be given to the means or medians of units which were used in calculating the various means of means or of medians. Table 57 lists the 20 variables each of which has a mean of means or of medians presented in a textual table. If 53 percent or more of the units whose coefficients of variation are under 40 percent is taken as an adequate level for accepting a mean as an index of a variable that represents the characteristic or description of a function of a unit, nine of the variables so indexed qualify. All nine of these variables also qualify under the test applied to the indices of variables listed in Table 56. These nine variables are:

1. Years of age
2. Years of school completed
3. Number in family
4. Number in household
5. Friendship percent score
6. Score on reaction to project teaching
7. Score on relationship to College of Home Economics
8. Pre-test score on Floor Facts lesson
9. Post-test score on Floor Facts lesson

Thus, of the 42 mean indices of variables listed in Table 56, 22 had coefficients of variation that were considered adequate (see page 113), but the means of 12 of these variables were either means of means or means of medians which in turn required testing for adequacy by an examination of coefficients of variation. It has been indicated above that nine of these 12 variables had means or medians whose coefficients of variation by our criterion qualified as adequate. This means that the following list of 19 variables appearing in the study may be considered adequate:

1. Years of age
2. Years of school completed
3. Number in family
4. Number in household

5. Rating unit high or very high
6. Number of members in unit
7. Friendship percent score
8. Motive for belonging to unit--wanting to learn
9. Motive for belonging to unit--wanting to enjoy social life
10. Score on reaction to project teaching
11. Percent of unit members learned something applied
12. Percent of unit members who thought planning meetings useful
13. Number of hours unit devoted to meetings
14. Number of hours unit devoted to project lessons
15. Percent of total meeting time of unit devoted to project lessons
16. Percent of unit members making use of HD unit for information
17. Score on relationship to College of Home Economics
18. Pre-test score on Floor Facts lesson
19. Post-test score on Floor Facts lesson

Table 58 lists 28 mean or median indices of variables for which individual members of HD units (clubs) were the unit of analysis. These means or medians were presented in textual tables preceding this part of the report. Accompanying the name of each index and its variable are the actual mean or median value, its coefficient of variation, and indication of whether the coefficient is under 40 percent. Although the variables and their measures of central tendency which are considered here are not related to the problem of indexing variables applying to units, the analysis serves to indicate the adequacy of the means and medians appearing in textual tables where the individual member is the unit of analysis.

Of the 28 means or medians, 15 had coefficients of variation under 40 percent. The under 40 percent coefficients were associated with the following variables:

1. Friendship percent score
2. Years of age
3. Years of school completed
4. Pre-test score for Floor Facts lesson
5. Post-test score for Floor Facts lesson

Each of these variables was indexed by a mean or median for three classes of unit members, and for all five variables the coefficient of variation of the mean or median of each class was below 40 percent.

Table 57

Percentages of Units Whose Coefficients of Variation for Means or Medians Were Under 40 Percent for Variables Used to Characterize Units or Describe Their Functions Where the Measure of Central Tendency Was a Mean of Means or of Medians

Mean or Median Indices of Variables	Percent of units with CV under 40
1. Median age of members, Table 2[a]	100
2. Median years of school completed, Table 3[a]	100
3. Mean number of home economics courses taken, Table 4	0
4. Mean number in family, Table 5	83
5. Mean number in household, Table 6	80
6. Mean participation score, Table 11	8
7. Mean number of years of unit membership, Table 15	23
8. Mean friendship percent score of members, Table 17	92
9. Mean percent of unit members claimed as close friends, Table 18	4
10. Mean percent of unit members known very little, Table 19	0
11. Mean percent of unit members not known, Table 20	15
12. Mean percent of members visited by different members one or more times in past three months, Table 21	4
13. Mean number of different leadership positions held, Table 26	2
14. Mean percent of leadership years, Table 30	2
15. Mean number of extension projects in which members participated (1964-65), Table 33	48
16. Mean scores on reaction to project teaching, Table 34	53
17. Mean scores on relationship to College of Home Economics, Table 50	63
18. Mean score on pre-test for Floor Facts lesson, Table 51	91
19. Mean score on post-test for Floor Facts lesson, Table 52	100
20. Mean of mean differences between pre- and post-test scores for Floor Facts lesson, Table 53	26

[a] CV is not usually applied to medians, but it was considered a useful application here.

Table 58

Means and Coefficients of Variation for Variables Whose Means or Medians Are Based on Individual Members

Mean or median indices of variables[a]	Mean or median	CV	CV under 40 percent
1. Median number of women recruited by unit members, Table 22 (N=784)	1.3	73	
2. Mean number of home economics courses taken, Table 54			
a. All members exclusive of 55 Floor Facts Project leaders (N=966)	2.4	146	
b. All Floor Facts Project leaders (N=55)	3.2	156	
c. Floor Facts Project leaders whose units had usable pre- and post-tests from the same individuals (N=43)	3.8	145	
3. Mean organizational participation score, Table 54			
a. All members exclusive of 55 Floor Facts Project leaders (N=966)	7.5	69	
b. All Floor Facts Project leaders (N=55)	10.0	49	
c. Floor Facts Project leaders whose units had usable pre- and post-tests from the same individuals (N=43)	10.1	49	
4. Mean friendship percent score in unit to which belong, Table 54			
a. All members exclusive of 55 Floor Facts Project leaders (N=966)	55.2	34	X
b. All Floor Facts Project leaders (N=55)	64.4	17	X
c. Floor Facts Project leaders whose units had usable pre- and post-tests from the same individuals (N=43)	64.0	17	X
5. Mean number of years of membership in unit to which belong, Table 54			
a. All members exclusive of 55 Floor Facts Project leaders (N=966)	4.2	131	
b. All Floor Facts Project leaders (N=55)	5.1	104	
c. Floor Facts Project leaders whose units had usable pre- and post-tests from the same individuals (N=43)	5.4	102	
6. Median age, Table 54			
a. All members exclusive of 55 Floor Facts Project leaders (N=966)	34.8	20	X
b. All Floor Facts Project leaders (N=55)	33.8	19	X
c. Floor Facts Project leaders whose units had usable pre- and post-tests from the same individuals (N=43)	33.4	18	X

---

[a] N's represent number of unit members for whom means or medians were calculated.

Mean or median indices of variables[a]	Mean or median	CV	CV under 40 percent
7. Median years of school completed, Table 54			
a. All members exclusive of 55 Floor Facts Project leaders (N=966)	12.4	10	X
b. All Floor Facts Project leaders (N=55)	13.2	11	X
c. Floor Facts Project leaders whose units had usable pre- and post-tests from the same individuals (N=43)	12.9	10	X
8. Pre-test score for Floor Facts lesson, Table 55			
a. All women participating in Floor Facts Project and taking pre- and post-tests (N=413)	10.9	32	X
b. All Floor Facts Project leaders (N=57)	11.6	24	X
c. Floor Facts Project leaders whose units had usable pre- and post-tests from the same individuals (N=45)	11.8	25	X
9. Post-test mean score for Floor Facts lesson, Table 55			
a. All women participating in Floor Facts Project and taking pre- and post-tests (N=413)	16.1	17	X
b. All Floor Facts Project leaders (N=57)	16.5	13	X
c. Floor Facts Project leaders whose units had usable pre- and post-tests from the same individuals (N=45)	16.7	13	X
10. Difference between pre- and post-test means for Floor Facts lesson, Table 55			
a. All women participating in Floor Facts Project and taking pre- and post-tests (N=413)	5.2	69	
b. All Floor Facts Project leaders (N=57)	4.9	45	
c. Floor Facts Project leaders whose units had usable pre- and post-tests from the same individuals (N=45)	4.9	45	

---

[a] N's represent number of unit members for whom means or medians were calculated.

APPENDIX A

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR UNIT MEMBERS

STUDY OF HOME DEMONSTRATION UNITS

INDIVIDUAL MEMBER QUESTIONNAIRE

No.______________________________ Name of unit___________________

Interviewer_____________ _______ Date___________________________

1. How many years have you been a member of the unit to which you now belong? (check one)
   1) _____ years
   2) _____ new member of this unit
   3) _____ new member never member of an Onondaga unit before
2. How many years have you been a member of other home demonstration units or clubs anywhere? _____ years
3. Years of schooling (circle highest number of years):

   Under 8, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 16+
4. How many different courses in home economics did you take? (enter number)
   1) _____ in high school
   2) _____ in college
   3) _____ in adult education (excluding HD study)
5. Think back to the first time you joined your present unit and indicate by what method you were recruited for membership? (check one)
   1) _____ Was a member when unit was first organized
   2) _____ Invited by a friend
   3) _____ Referred to unit by H. D. agent
   4) _____ Learned about and joined on my own
   5) _____ Other (write in) ______________________________
6. Will you indicate the degree of your friendship for each of the following people who are now members of your home demonstration unit? (Use loose sheet with this question and names on it. Give sheet and pencil to interviewee and have her check it. Interviewer review after interviewee checks.)

7. Your membership in organizations:

(a) Name of organization	(b) Check if member	(c) Enter number of offices now holding (include committee chairmanships and Sunday school teacher or project leader in home demonstration unit) (If none, enter 0)	(d) Rate the organizations to which you belong according to what you think is their standing in your community (check one for each organization)				
			very high	high	average	low	very low
Home demonstration unit							
County home demonstration executive committee							
County Extension Service Association board of directors							
Church or synagogue							
Sunday or Sabbath school							
Other church organizations: (enter names)							
PTA							
Home Bureau							
Farm Bureau							
League of Women Voters							
Sorority, lodge or fraternal (enter names)							
Auxiliary of veterans: (enter names)							
Women's club							
Garden club							
Sports or hobby: (enter names)							
Other: (enter names)							

8. Women have a number of reasons for belonging to an organization. Will you please indicate what your reasons are for belonging to the H. D. unit of which you are a member? (Check as many as you want to)

   1) _____ Because I enjoy (or expected to enjoy) the social life which the unit provides.

   2) _____ Because I want to learn more about the best ways to run my household (such as diet, sewing, buying, managing my work).

   3) _____ Because I want to learn more about community problems and how to work on them.

   4) _____ Because I want to learn more about child-rearing.

   5) _____ Because I want to learn more about husband-wife relationships.

   6) _____ Because I want to obtain some information about

      a) ______________________________ (fill in)
      b) ______________________________ (fill in)
      c) ______________________________ (fill in)

   7) _____ Because a close friend wanted me to belong.

   8) _____ Because I have belonged to this unit for a long time.

   9) _____ Because I like to have an evening, afternoon, or day away from home.

   10) _____ Other ____

9. Employment

   1) Do you work for pay (wages or salary) as an employee of someone? (check one)

      a) _____ Yes, work full-time (35 hours a week or more)

      b) _____ Yes, work part-time (less than 35 hours a week)

      c) _____ No, not at all

   2) Are you self-employed (rent tourist rooms, sew, etc.) from which you earn money, or do you work on the farm or in a family business from which you share the income but do not receive wages or salary? (check one):

      a) _____ Yes, I work full-time in one or more of the ways listed above (35 hours a week or more)

      b) _____ Yes, I work part-time in one or more of the ways listed above (less than 35 hours a week)

      c) _____ No, not at all

10. Please give the following information about your family composition.

Items 1), 2), and 3) apply to those married, widowed, divorced, or separated.

1) Children living at home (include foster children)

a) Males (list by giving age of each):

____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____
(circle any temporarily away from home in school, etc., now, fall of 1965)

b) Females (list by giving age of each):

____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____
(circle any temporarily away from home in school, etc., now, fall of 1965)

c) If no children at home, check here ____

2) Others (relatives and nonrelatives) living with family (same house and board)

a) Males (list by giving age of each): __ __ __

b) Females (list by giving age of each): __ __ __

c) If no others (relatives or nonrelatives) living with family, check here ____

3) Husband (list by giving his age): ____; or check no husband living with family ____

4) Single, never married (check if applies) ____

11. Husband's occupation

1) Occupation of head of household (husband). (Describe the job as specifically as possible; give more than place or company name): ____________________
____

2) If no husband in household, occupation of person who is head (indicate whether mother, son, daughter, etc.) (Describe the job as specifically as possible; give more than place or co. name): ________________
____

12. Leadership positions held since joining this unit: (enter numbers for as many as apply)

    1) _____ Number of years as chairman
    2) _____ Number of years as vice-chairman
    3) _____ Number of years as secretary
    4) _____ Number of years as treasurer
    5) _____ Number of years as _____________ project leader
    (name of project area - see list)
    6) _____ Number of years as _____________ project leader
    (name of project area - see list)
    7) _____ Number of years as _____________ project leader
    (name of project area - see list)
    8) _____ Number of years as _____________ project leader
    (name of project area - see list)
    9) _____ No positions held

13. If you indicated in question 12 that you had ever been a project leader in this unit, will you indicate for each project area for which you have been a leader the specific name of the most recent project taught in that area and how you came to be the project teacher (leader)?

Name of most recent project taught under each area indicated as leader in question 12	How came to be the project teacher (leader) (check one for each project) Volunteered	Asked by unit chairman	Asked by some of unit members	Other (write in)
1) ______________	______	________	________	_______________
2) ______________	______	________	________	_______________
3) ______________	______	________	________	_______________
4) ______________	______	________	________	_______________

14. Since becoming a member of this unit, how many women have you gotten to join the unit? (enter number including 0=none)

    1) _____
    2) _____ Doesn't apply--new member

15. If one or more members have been recruited by you, indicate what you did to get them to join:

Name	What you did
1) ____________________	____________________
2) ____________________	____________________
3) ____________________	____________________
4) ____________________	____________________

5) _____ Doesn't apply--new member

16. As you see it, what is the way in which your unit chooses its program for the year?

1) _____ Don't know

2) _____ Each member checks her preference for program topics from a list of total topics developed by the county program committee and Cornell University. The results are tabulated and those topics receiving the largest number of votes are included in the unit program.

3) _____ Each member checks a list of her interests; these results are sent to HD office which makes the final decision on the basis of the interests of a majority of women in the county.

4) _____ Unit officers decide what the program shall be.

5) _____ Other: ____________________

____

____

6) _____ Doesn't apply--new member

17. From a personal point of view what do you expect to learn through your participation in the projects of your unit?

____

____

____

18. Please indicate your reaction to the teachings of projects in this unit: (check as many as you want to)

Doesn't apply--new member _____ (check)

1) Length

    1) _____ Lessons are too short
    2) _____ Lessons are too long
    3) _____ Lessons are about right in length

2) Discussion

    1) _____ There is too much discussion
    2) _____ There is too little discussion
    3) _____ Amount of discussion is about right

3) Project leaders

    1) _____ The project leaders do not have adequate training
    2) _____ The project leaders have adequate training

4) Subject matter

    1) _____ The material presented is usually too general
    2) _____ The material presented is well-balanced between principles and concrete illustrations
    3) _____ The material presented is too concrete--too much how-to-do-it

5) Attention

    1) _____ The members who attend do not give proper attention to the teaching
    2) _____ The members who attend give good attention to the teaching

6) Comments about teaching of projects: ____________________

____

____

19. Will you please indicate the degree to which you make use of the following sources of information for homemaking:
(check one for each)

	Much use	Some use	Little use	No use
1) Monthly newsletter	____	____	____	____
2) Television programs of HD department	____	____	____	____
3) Television programs on homemaking	____	____	____	____
4) Radio programs on homemaking	____	____	____	____
5) Newspaper articles	____	____	____	____
6) Magazine articles	____	____	____	____
7) Cornell bulletins	____	____	____	____
8) Bulletins from other universities	____	____	____	____
9) Publications of industrial concerns (food, textiles, etc.)	____	____	____	____
10) Your home demonstration unit	____	____	____	____
11) Personal contact (by visit or phone) with HD agent	____	____	____	____
12) Advertisements in newspapers & magazines	____	____	____	____
13) Advertisements over radio & television	____	____	____	____
14) Other (write in)				
________________	____	____	____	____
________________	____	____	____	____
________________	____	____	____	____

20. How often have you sought information or advice from a HD agent in this county in the past year?

____

21. The purpose of the Cooperative Extension Service is in cooperation with Cornell University to extend to the people of the state the educational programs of the New York State Colleges of Agriculture and Home Economics. The College of Home Economics has primary responsibility for educational work with the county demonstration departments and the HD units. Will you indicate how you feel about this relationship of the College of Home Economics to home demonstration work in this county by indicating your opinion regarding the following:

1) It is necessary for the college to take leadership in working with county to determine subject matter offered

___ fully agree; ___ partially agree; ___ do not agree at all;

___ don't know

2) It is desirable for the college to set standards for what is taught

___ fully agree; ___ partially agree; ___ do not agree at all;

___ don't know

3) The college through its specialists provides good training for our project leaders

___ fully agree; ___ partially agree; ___ do not agree at all;

___ don't know

4) The college through the training given the home demonstration agents provides good training for our project leaders

___ fully agree; ___ partially agree; ___ do not agree at all;

___ don't know

22. Is it your impression that project leaders (teachers) are difficult to find in your unit?

1) _____ Yes

2) _____ No

3) _____ Don't know

4) _____ Doesn't apply--new member

If yes to question 22, why do you think this is true? ___

____

____

____

23. Have you ever attended a meeting of your unit at which the program for the next year was being planned?

1) _____ Yes

2) _____ No

3) _____ Doesn't apply--new member

(1) If yes, did you consider this meeting:

(a) _____ Useful

(b) _____ Of some use

(c) _____ Of little use; if checked, do you feel you wasted your time by attending this meeting?

_____ Yes

_____ No

(2) If no, did not attend (check as many as apply):

(a) _____ Because of personal circumstances

(b) _____ Because you considered the planning meeting a waste of time

24. Will you think back into the past program year (1964-65) and tell us what were the three study projects in which you participated and which you liked best? Then give us the information asked for in column (2) and (3). (Show interviewee list of unit's projects)

	(1) Study project	(2) What did you learn that you applied	(3) Did not learn anything could apply (check)
1)			
2)			
3)			

4) _____ In how many extension offered projects did you participate during the program year 1964-65? (Be sure interviewer shows interviewee the unit's list of projects)

5) _____ In how many other activities or projects offered in your unit's 1964-65 program year did you participate (such as knitting or other handicraft, etc.)?

6) _____ Doesn't apply--new member

25. When you attend the unit meetings what is your usual

1) Physical state?

(1) _____ Feel real energetic

(2) _____ Feel about average

(3) _____ Feel pretty tired

(4) _____ Doesn't apply--new member

2) Mental state?

(1) _____ Feel alert

(2) _____ Feel moderately alert

(3) _____ Feel below normal in alertness

(4) _____ Doesn't apply--new member

26. Below is a list of the members of your unit. Will you indicate how often in the past three months you have visited with each member at some place other than the unit meetings? (Use loose sheet with this question and names on it. Give sheet and pencil to interviewee and have her enter figures. Interviewer review after interviewee responds.)

27. Your age (check the age group to which you belong)

1) _____ 19 years and under

2) _____ 20 - 24 years

3) _____ 25 - 29 years

4) _____ 30 - 34 years

5) _____ 35 - 39 years

6) _____ 40 - 44 years

7) _____ 45 - 49 years

8) _____ 50 - 54 years

9) _____ 55 - 59 years

10) _____ 60 - 64 years

11) _____ 65 - 69 years

12) _____ 70 - 74 years

13) _____ 75 years and over

28. Income: check one of the following which comes closest to your total family (wife, husband, and other members combined) net income after farm or business expenses were deducted for the calendar year (1964):

1) _____ Less than $5,000

2) _____ $5,000 - $9,999

3) _____ $10,000+

28A. Your place of residence (check the one that best describes where you live and fill in the blank called for):

1) _____ In the city of Syracuse

2) _____ On a farm from which you get half or more of your income (estimate)

3) _____ On a farm from which you get less than half of your income (estimate)

4) _____ In the open country but not on a farm

5) _____ In the village of ______________ which has a population of less than 2,500

6) _____ In the village of ______________ which has a population of 2,500 to 10,000

7) _____ Near the village of ______________ in a built-up suburban area

8) _____ Near the city of Syracuse in a built-up suburban area

ASK OF UNIT CHAIRMEN ONLY

29. How are project leaders selected in your unit? (check as many as apply)

1) _____ By volunteering

2) _____ By the chairman asking the person to be leader

3) _____ By some unit member asking the person to be leader

4) _____ Other (write in): ______________________________

____

____

5) _____ Don't know because a new unit

30. What is the procedure which you follow in your unit in selecting projects for the program year? (Have the interviewee give a concise account of procedure.)

____

____

____

____

_____ Don't know because a new unit

31. Will you give us a comparison of the usual attendance at your program planning meeting and other meetings?

	Program planning meetings	Other meetings
	(check one under each heading)	
1) 75 percent or more attend	_____	_____
2) 50 - 74 percent attend	_____	_____
3) 25 - 49 percent attend	_____	_____
4) Under 25 percent attend	_____	_____

5) Please comment on this comparison: ____________________

____

____

____

6) Don't know because a new unit

32. Will you indicate how often you met last year and plan to meet this year? (enter numbers or check)

1) _____ No. of times last year; _____ don't know because new unit

2) _____ No. of times plan to meet this year

3) _____ Not decided how often will meet this year

33. In what place or places does your unit meet? (check as many as apply)

1) _____ Houses of members
2) _____ School house
3) _____ Grange hall
4) _____ Church
5) _____ Lodge hall
6) _____ Other

34. What problems does the physical setting of your meetings present?

(1) If home is checked in 5:

____

(2) If school house is checked in 5:

____

(3) If Grange hall is checked in 5:

____

(question continued on next page)

(4) If church is checked in 5:

_______________________ ______________________________

(5) If lodge hall is checked in 5:

____

(6) If other is checked in 5:

____

(7) _____No problems

35. Will you indicate the usual (on the average) amount of time for the following:

1) _____Average number of hours for total meeting

2) _____Average number of hours for project lesson

3) _____Don't know because a new unit

36. Will you give us the number of years this unit has been in existence?

1) _____Number of years

2) _____Organized since spring

3) _____Don't know

37. Will you indicate what percent of your members usually come in late for the project lesson?

1) _____Percent

2) _____Don't know because a new unit

38. Will you indicate the usual hours at which your unit meets? (Be sure to indicate AM and PM.)

1) From __________to ___________

2) _____Not decided on yet

3) _____Have no regular time

4) _____Don't know because a new unit

Schedule No. _____

Unit No. _____

Unit Name __________

6. Will you indicate the degree of your friendship for each of the following people who are now members of your home demonstration unit?

	Name	One of closest	An average acquaintance	Know very little	Do not know
1)	Names of unit members were entered here.			___	___
2)	______________	___	___	___	___
3)	______________	___	___	___	___
4)	______________	___	___	___	___
5)	______________	___	___	___	___
6)	______________	___	___	___	___
7)	______________	___	___	___	___
8)	______________	___	___	___	___
9)	______________	___	___	___	___
10)	______________	___	___	___	___
11)	______________	___	___	___	___
12)	______________	___	___	___	___
13)	______________	___	___	___	___
14)	______________	___	___	___	___
15)	______________	___	___	___	___
16)	______________	___	___	___	___
17)	______________	___	___	___	___
18)	______________	___	___	___	___
19)	______________	___	___	___	___
20)	______________	___	___	___	___
21)	______________	___	___	___	___
22)	______________	___	___	___	___
23)	______________	___	___	___	___
24)	______________	___	___	___	___
25)	______________	___	___	___	___
26)	______________	___	___	___	___

Schedule No. ____

Unit No. ____

Unit Name ________

26. Below is a list of the members of your unit. Will you indicate how often in the past three months you have visited with each member at your and her home?

	Name	How often visited within past 3 months (August, September, October) (Enter 0 for none)
1)	Names of unit members were entered here.	
2)		
3)		
4)		
5)		
6)		
7)		
8)		
9)		
10)		
11)		
12)		
13)		
14)		
15)		
16)		
17)		
18)		
19)		
20)		
21)		
22)		
23)		
24)		
25)		
26)		

APPENDIX B

FLOOR FACTS TEST WITH CORRECT ANSWERS INDICATED

Name________________

Unit________________

Date given quiz______

FLOOR FACTS SELF QUIZ

Part I. Place the letter of the statement in Column B on the line that best describes the term in Column A.

Column A

c 1. Mastic
d 2. Terrazzo
e 3. Parquet
a 4. Grout
b 5. Embossed
f 6. Carnauba

Column B

a. mortar used to hold ceramic tiles securely
b. surface texture applied to flooring
c. pasty substance used as adhesive to fasten tiles in place
d. marble chips held in place with concrete or cement
e. patterned inlay in wood flooring created by using many short board links in various directions of the grain
f. durable natural wax
g. a clear coating of vinyl applied to tile flooring

Part II. Place the letter of the word or group of words that best completes the phrase on the line before the phrase.

c 1. A flooring which might be easily stained with common household acids and alkalis is:
   a. light colored vinyl
   b. embossed linoleum
   c. marble

b 2. Tile flooring would be as suitable as sheet goods flooring in the:
   a. laundry
   b. bedroom
   c. bathroom

a 3. Which flooring would be a suitable choice for covering a concrete basement floor in a family room?
   a. asphalt tile
   b. linoleum
   c. rubber or cork

a 4. The easiest floor to lay for a do-it-yourself fan is:
   a. asphalt tile
   b. vinyl tile
   c. sheet good flooring

a 5. A wood floor finish that may be readily patched in worn traffic areas is:
- a. penetrating floor sealer
- b. varnish
- c. lacquer

b 6. Floor waxes are classified into 2 categories for deciding which wax to use on what flooring:
- a. liquid wax or paste wax
- b. solvent base wax or water base wax
- c. self-polishing wax or polishing wax that requires buffing

c 7. Solvent waxes are:
- a. not availabe as self-polishing
- b. safe for all resilient floors
- c. now sold as self-polishing

a 8. On which of the following types of flooring is choice of waxes most important?
- a. wood
- b. vinyl
- c. slate

b 9. The least expensive, yet most durable type of wax is:
- a. a self-cleaning, solvent base, liquid wax
- b. a solvent base paste wax
- c. a liquid, self-polishing solvent base wax

c 10. Common alkaline floor cleaners are harmful to:
- a. rubber tile
- b. vinyl asbestos tile
- c. linoleum flooring

c 11. The most satisfactory of the following cleaners for wood floors is:
- a. a mild ammonia solution
- b. a dampened sponge mop
- c. a liquid solvent base wax

c 12. Floors should be waxed:
- a. every 6 months
- b. every other week
- c. when they look dull and buffing no longer revives the shine

b 13. Concrete floors that have a tendency to "dust-off":
- a. cannot be helped
- b. can be etched with an acid solution
- c. should be painted with enamel paint

d 14. Electric floor polishers have had serious draw-backs up to now because:
- a. their high speed for application splashed the wax
- b. they were very expensive
- c. they did not perform several floor cleaning operations
- d. all of the above

b 15. Which of the following is true?
- a. vinyl tile costs less than vinyl sheet flooring
- b. installation costs may be more than the flooring itself
- c. vinyl sheet goods may be readily installed by a do-it-yourself fan

APPENDIX C

LEADER'S REPORT FORM

LEADER REPORT - FLOOR FACTS

Leader's name______________________ Unit name________________

Date (s) taught___________

1. How much time did you use for actually teaching this lesson?
   ____less than 1 hour
   ____1 to 1½ hours
   ____more than 1½ hours
   ____single lesson
   ____two lessons
2. What teaching aids did you use?
   ____leader's guide and mimeo materials
   ____facts about floor care bulletin
   ____floor facts kit from office
   ____magazine pictures
   ____other, specify________________________________
3. A meeting place may help or hinder the progress of a meeting. How appropriate was this place for your purpose?
   ____excellent
   ____adequate
   ____inadequate
4. Did your unit members follow your instructions for taking the quiz?
   _____yes _____no
5. How much time did you find it necessary to use in preparation for your teaching after you attended the county meeting? ___________hours
6. Did you experience any difficulty in presenting the lesson?
   _____yes _____no; Explain__________________________
7. What topics did you cover?
   _____types of waxes
   _____hard floors
   _____resilient floors
   _____grade
   _____underlayments
   _____selection factors
   _____care factors
   _____use of equipment
   _____others--specify___________
   ____
8. How would you appraise your meeting?__________________
   ____
9. What else do you wish had been covered at the leader training session in the office?____________________
   ____
10. How do you feel about this teaching experience?
    _____satisfied
    _____partially satisfied
    _____unsatisfied
    _____why do you feel this way?____________________
    ____

APPENDIX D

TABLES PRESENTING DATA ON UNIT MEMBERS IRRESPECTIVE OF UNIT CONNECTIONS

Table 1

Number and Percentage Distribution of
Unit Members According to Place of Residence

Place of residence	Unit members Number	Percent
In the city of Syracuse	183	18
On a farm from which you get half or more of your income	12	1
On a farm from which you get less than half of your income	16	2
In the open country but not on a farm	113	11
In a village of less than 2,500	103	10
In a village of 2,500 - 10,000	106	10
Near a village of under 2,500 in a built-up suburban area	110	11
Near a village of 2,500 and over in a built-up suburban area	261	26
Near city in built-up suburban area	115	11
Total	1,019	100
No information	2	

Table 2

Number and Percentage Distribution
Of Unit Members According to Age

Age	Unit members Number	 Percent
19 years and under	3	.3
20 - 24 years	74	7.3
25 - 29 years	199	19.5
30 - 34 years	226	22.2
35 - 39 years	191	18.8
40 - 44 years	99	9.7
45 - 49 years	84	8.2
50 - 54 years	52	5.1
55 - 59 years	31	3.0
60 - 64 years	28	2.7
65 - 69 years	16	1.6
70 - 74 years	12	1.2
75 years and over	4	.4
Total	1,019	100.0
No information	2	

Table 3

Number and Percentage Distribution of Unit Members According to Years of Schooling

Years of schooling	Unit members	
	Number	Percent
8 or under	21	2
9	15	1
10	27	3
11	30	3
12	429	42
13	141	14
14	104	10
15	70	7
16	117	12
Over 16	62	6
Total	1,016	100
No information	5	

Table 4

Number and Percentage Distribution of Unit Members According to Number of Courses Taken in Home Economics[a]

Number of courses taken in home economics	Unit members	
	Number	Percent
None	253	25
1	180	18
2	262	25
3	133	13
4	79	8
5	43	4
6	19	2
7	11	1
8 - 19	17	2
20 or more	24	2
Total	1,021	100

---

[a] Exclusive of home demonstration projects

Table 5

Number and Percentage Distribution of Unit Members According to Number in Family

	Unit members	
Number in family	Number	Percent
1	33	3
2	122	12
3	157	15
4	309	31
5	227	23
6	116	11
7	30	3
8	15	1
9 or more	12	1
Total	1,021	100

Table 6

Number and Percentage Distribution of Unit Members According to Number in Household

Number in household (family plus others)	Unit members	
	Number	Percent
1	25	2
2	111	11
3	157	15
4	298	29
5	229	23
6	129	13
7	41	4
8	18	2
9 or more	12	1
Total	1,020	100
No information	1	

Table 7

Number and Percentage Distribution of Unit Members According to Occupations of Husbands

Occupational classes	Unit members Number	 Percent
Professional, technical, and kindred workers	351	36
Managers, officials, and proprietors except farmers	140	14
Clerical and kindred workers	54	5
Sales workers	94	10
Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers	166	17
Operatives and kindred workers	95	10
Service workers (private households and others)	26	3
Laborers except farm and mine	8	1
Farmers	18	2
Unemployed or retired	20	2
Total	972	100
No information	1	
No husband living with family	48	

Table 8

Number and Percentage Distribution of Unit Members According to Full- and Part-Time Employment, by Someone Or Self, with Total Number Employed by Someone, Self, or Both

Employment status	Unit members Number	Unit members Percent
Work for pay as an employee of someone[a]		
Yes, full-time (35 hours or more per week)	102	10
Yes, part-time (less than 35 hours per week)	160	16
Do not work for someone	759	74
Total	1,021	100
Self employed[a]		
Yes, full-time (35 hours or more per week)	10	1
Yes, part-time (less than 35 hours per week)	76	7
Do not work for self	935	92
Total	1,021	100
Total number employed (by someone, self, or both)	328	32

[a] Twenty women were employed by someone and also by self.

Table 9

Number and Percentage Distribution of Unit Members According to Participation Score

Participation score	Unit members Number	Unit members Percent
1 - 2	134	13
3 - 4	211	21
5 - 6	168	17
7 - 8	148	14
9 - 10	107	10
11 - 12	81	8
13 - 14	64	6
15 - 19	78	8
20 and over	30	3
Total	1,021	100

Table 10

Number and Percentage Distribution of Unit Members According to Total Estimated Net Family Income: 1964

Total estimated net family income	Unit members Number	Unit members Percent
Less than $5,000	81	8.2
$5,000 - $9,999	658	67.0
$10,000 and over	243	24.7
Retired (no income given)	1	.1
Total	983	100.0
No information	38	

Table 11

Number and Percentage Distribution of Unit Members According to Number of Years Member of Present Unit

Number of years membership	Unit members Number	Percent
New member (0)	308	30
1	53	5
2	138	14
3	129	13
4	64	6
5	65	6
6	49	5
7	26	3
8	35	3
9	13	1
10	32	3
11+	107	11
Total	1,019	100
No information	2	

Table 12

Number and Percentage Distribution of Unit Members According to Friendship Percent Scores

Friendship percent score	Unit members	
	Number	Percent
0 - 9	14	1
10 - 19	37	4
20 - 29	44	4
30 - 39	87	8
40 - 49	162	16
50 - 59	181	18
60 - 69	267	26
70 - 79	160	16
80 - 89	51	5
90 - 100	17	2
Total	1,020	100
No information	1	

Table 13

Number and Percentage Distribution of Unit Members According to Percent of Unit Members Claimed as Close Friends

Percent of unit members claimed as close friends	Unit members Number	Unit members Percent
0	93	9.1
1 - 9	223	21.9
10 - 19	293	28.7
20 - 29	184	18.1
30 - 39	97	9.5
40 - 49	51	5.0
50 - 59	28	2.7
60 - 69	26	2.5
70 - 79	10	1.0
80 - 89	6	.6
90 - 100	9	.9
Total	1,020	100.0
No information	1	

Table 14

Number and Percentage Distribution of Unit Members According To Percent of Other Unit Members Known Very Little

Percent of other unit members known very little	Unit members	
	Number	Percent
0	171	17
1 - 9	100	10
10 - 19	209	21
20 - 29	196	19
30 - 39	152	15
40 - 49	74	7
50 - 59	48	5
60 - 69	25	2
70 - 79	15	1
80 - 89	13	1
90 - 100	17	2
Total	1,020	100
No information	1	

Table 15

Number and Percentage Distribution of Unit Members According to Percent of Other Unit Members Not Known

Percent of other unit members not known	Unit members	
	Number	Percent
0	453	44
1 - 9	138	13
10 - 19	160	16
20 - 29	89	9
30 - 39	57	6
40 - 49	33	3
50 - 59	28	3
60 - 69	22	2
70 - 79	18	2
80 - 89	13	1
90 - 100	9	1
Total	1,020	100
No information	1	

Table 16

Number and Percentage Distribution of Unit Members According to Percent of Other Unit Members Visited One or More Times in Past Three Months

Percent of other unit members visited one or more times in past three months	Unit members	
	Number	Percent
0	90	9
1 - 9	211	20
10 - 19	274	27
20 - 29	171	17
30 - 39	98	10
40 - 49	79	8
50 - 59	35	3
60 - 69	25	2
70 - 79	16	2
80 - 89	7	1
90 - 100	14	1
Total	1,020	100
No information	1	

Table 17

Number and Percentage Distribution of Unit Members According To Number of Different Leadership Positions Ever Held

Number of different leadership positions held	Unit members Number	Unit members Percent
0	372[a]	36.4
1	207	20.3
2	141	13.8
3	112	11.0
4	74	7.2
5	52	5.1
6	37	3.6
7	13	1.3
8	11	1.1
9	2	0.2
Total	1,021	100.0

---

[a] Of the 372 members who had never held a leadership position, 234, or 63 percent, indicated the question calling for leadership did not apply to them because they were new members.

Table 18

Number and Percentage Distribution of Unit Members According to Percent of Membership Years Devoted to Leadership

Percent of membership years devoted to leadership[a]	Unit members	
	Number	Percent
0	372[b]	36.5
1 - 24	41	4.0
25 - 49	87	8.5
50 - 74	167	16.4
75 - 99	55	5.4
100 - 124	180	17.7
125 - 149	45	4.4
150 - 174	28	2.7
175 - 199	4	0.4
200 - 224	32	3.1
225 - 249	5	0.5
250+	3	0.3
Total	1,019	99.9[c]
No information	2	

---

[a] Percent of membership years devoted to leadership = sum of years of leadership of each member reporting divided by number of years of her membership in unit times 100.

[b] Includes 234 new members who held no leadership positions.

[c] Failure to total 100 percent due to rounding.

Table 19

Number and Percentage Distribution of Unit Members According to Whether or Not Considered It Difficult to Find Project Leaders

Difficult to find project leaders	Unit members Number	 Percent
Yes	294	34
No	559	64
Don't know	21	2
Total	874	100
No information	2	
Doesn't apply--new member	145	

Table 20

Number and Percentage Distribution of Unit Members According to Number of Extension Projects and Non-Extension Projects in Which Participated: 1964-65

Number of projects	Extension projects Unit members		Non-extension projects Unit members	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
0	43	6	236	33
1	38	5	142	20
2	71	10	128	18
3	97	14	92	13
4	78	11	58	8
5	107	15	28	4
6	89	13	9	4
7	84	12	2	
8	42	6	9	
9	23	3	1	
10	13	5	1	
11	9		1	
12	6		--	
13	4		--	
14	2		1	
15	1		--	
Total	707	100	708	100
No information	21		21	
Doesn't apply (new member)	293		292	

Table 21

Number and Percentage Distribution of Unit Members According to Rating Scores on Reaction to Five Phases of Project Teaching[a]

Rating score on reaction to project teaching	Unit members	
	Number	Percent
+5	431	50.6
+4	88	10.3
+3	181	21.2
+2	34	4.0
+1	61	7.2
0	14	1.6
-1	33	3.9
-2	3	0.4
-3	7	0.8
Total	852	100.0
No information	6	
Doesn't apply (new member)	163	

---

[a] The five phases were length of lesson, discussion, project leader's training, subject matter, and attention.

Table 22

Number and Percentage Distribution of Unit Members According to Method of Choosing Unit Projects As They Saw It

Method of choosing projects as they saw it	Unit members Number	Unit members Percent
1. Each member checks her preference for program topics from list of total topics developed by county program committee and Cornell University. Topics receiving largest number of votes are included in unit programs.	695	82
2. Each member checks a list of her interests; results sent to HD office which makes final decision on basis of interests of a majority of women in county.	16	2
3. Unit officers decide what the program shall be.	10	1
4. Same as 1, plus they only add project if someone volunteers as leader.	12	1
5. Same as 1, plus vote to add other projects members interested in.	53	6
6. Other	24	3
7. Don't know	37	4
Total	847	99[a]
Doesn't apply--new member	174	

---

[a] Failure to total 100 percent due to rounding.

Table 23

Number and Percentage Distribution of Unit Members
According to Evaluation Levels for Program Planning Meetings

Evaluation of program planning meetings	Unit members	
	Number	Percent
Useful	685	88
Of some use	80	10
Of little use	11	2
Total	776	100
Doesn't apply--new member	188	
No information	1	
Never attended	56	

Table 24

Number and Percentage Distribution of Unit Members According To Scores on Relationship to College of Home Economics

Score on relationship to College of Home Economics[a]	Unit members	
	Number	Percent
0 (Don't know)	49	5
1	5	1
2	24	2
3	52	5
4	55	5
5	89	9
6	123	12
7	170	17
8	215	21
9	236	23
Total	1,018	100
No information	3	

[a] Includes only three of the four items in the questionnaire.

Table 25

Number and Percentage Distribution of Unit Members According to Scores on Pre-Test for Lesson on Floor Facts

Pre-test score	Unit members Number	Unit members Percent
0	2	0.5
1	0	0.0
2	3	0.7
3	6	1.5
4	6	1.5
5	10	2.4
6	18	4.4
7	22	5.3
8	34	8.2
9	39	9.4
10	42	10.2
11	39	9.4
12	60	14.6
13	37	9.0
14	42	10.2
15	22	5.3
16	10	2.4
17	13	3.1
18	3	0.7
19	3	0.7
20	0	0.0
21	2	0.5
Total	413	100.0

Table 26

Number and Percentage Distribution of Unit Members According to Scores on Post-Test for Lesson on Floor Facts

	Unit members	
Post-test score	Number	Percent
0	0	0.0
1	0	0.0
2	1	0.2
3	0	0.0
4	0	0.0
5	0	0.0
6	0	0.0
7	1	0.2
8	1	0.2
9	0	0.0
10	7	1.7
11	12	2.9
12	20	4.8
13	31	7.5
14	39	9.5
15	38	9.2
16	54	13.1
17	69	16.7
18	57	13.8
19	49	11.9
20	25	6.1
21	9	2.2
Total	413	100.0

P for t of difference of pre- and post-test means < .0005 (one-tail)

Table 27

Number and Percentage Distribution of Unit Members According To Difference in Pre- and Post-Tests for Lesson on Floor Facts

	Unit members	
Difference	Number	Percent
-9	1	0.2
-8	0	0.0
-7	0	0.0
-6	0	0.0
-5	0	0.0
-4	0	0.0
-3	0	0.0
-2	4	1.0
-1	11	2.7
0	19	4.6
+1	22	5.3
+2	32	7.7
+3	42	10.2
+4	59	14.3
+5	43	10.4
+6	44	10.6
+7	37	9.0
+8	25	6.1
+9	21	5.1
+10	17	4.1
+11	12	2.9
+12	11	2.7
+13	6	1.5
+14	3	0.7
+15	0	0.0
+16	1	0.2
+17	2	0.5
+18	1	0.2
Total	413	100.0

APPENDIX E

TABLES PRESENTING DETAILED DATA ON RELATIONSHIPS OF UNIT CHARACTERISTICS TO LEARNING OF MEMBERS PARTICIPATING IN FLOOR FACTS PROJECT

176-177

Table 1

Number and Percentage Distribution of Units According to Mean Differences of Pre- and Post-test Scores For Lesson on Floor Facts by Units with High and Low Mean Percent Of Members Living in Rural Places

Mean differences between pre- and post-test scores for units	Units with mean percent of members with rural residence			
	High (11-100)[a]		Low (0-10)[a]	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
1.0 - 1.9	0	0	0	0
2.0 - 2.9	5	21	2	9
3.0 - 3.9	0	0	3	13
4.0 - 4.9	6	25	6	26
5.0 - 5.9	7	29	5	22
6.0 - 6.9	4	17	5	22
7.0 - 7.9	1	4	1	4
8.0 - 8.9	1	4	1	4
Total	24	100	23	100
Means of mean differences	5.0		5.1	

P for t of difference of means of mean differences < .45 (one-tail).

---

[a] Divided into high and low at approximate median value.

Table 2

Number and Percentage Distribution of Units According to Mean Differences of Pre- and Post-test Scores For Lesson on Floor Facts by Units with High and Low Median Ages

Mean differences between pre- and post-test scores for units	Units with median age of members			
	High (36.0-64.5)[a]		Low (26.4-35.9)[a]	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
1.0 - 1.9	0	0	0	0
2.0 - 2.9	5	22	2	8
3.0 - 3.9	0	0	3	13
4.0 - 4.9	6	26	6	25
5.0 - 5.9	7	31	5	21
6.0 - 6.9	4	17	5	21
7.0 - 7.9	1	4	1	4
8.0 - 8.9	0	0	2	8
Total	23	100	24	100
Means of mean differences	4.8		5.3	

P for t of difference of means of mean differences $\leq .15$ (one-tail).

---

[a] Divided into high and low at approximate median value.

Table 3

Number and Percentage Distribution of Units According to Mean Differences of Pre- and Post-test Scores For Lesson on Floor Facts by Units with High and Low Mean Number in Family

Mean differences between pre- and post-test scores for units	Units with mean number in family			
	High (4.3-5.1)[a]		Low (1.9-4.2)[a]	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
1.0 - 1.9	0	0	0	0
2.0 - 2.9	3	12	4	18
3.0 - 3.9	3	12	0	0
4.0 - 4.9	8	32	4	18
5.0 - 5.9	7	28	5	23
6.0 - 6.9	2	8	7	32
7.0 - 7.9	0	0	2	9
8.0 - 8.9	2	8	0	0
Total	25	100	22	100
Means of mean differences	4.9		5.3	

P for t of difference of means of mean differences < .25 (one-tail).

---

[a] Divided into high and low at approximate median value.

Table 4

Number and Percentage Distribution of Units According to Mean Differences of Pre- and Post-test Scores For Lesson on Floor Facts by Units with High and Low Mean Years of Schooling

Mean differences between pre- and post-test scores for units	Units with mean years of schooling High (13.3-16.1)[a] No.	Percent	Units with mean years of schooling Low (10.6-13.2)[a] No.	Percent
1.0 - 1.9	0	0	0	0
2.0 - 2.9	6	26	1	4
3.0 - 3.9	2	9	1	4
4.0 - 4.9	7	30	5	21
5.0 - 5.9	3	13	9	38
6.0 - 6.9	5	22	4	17
7.0 - 7.9	0	0	2	8
8.0 - 8.9	0	0	2	8
Total	23	100	24	100
Means of mean differences	4.5		5.7	

P for t of difference of means of mean differences < .01 (one-tail).

Pre-test mean scores were significantly different, P for t < .01 (two-tail).

When co-variance analysis was used, F was not significant at .05.

---

[a] Divided into high and low at approximate median value.

Table 5

Number and Percentage Distribution of Units According to Mean Differences of Pre- and Post-test Scores For Lesson on Floor Facts by Units with High and Low Mean Number Of Courses Taken In Home Economics

Mean differences between pre- and post-test scores for units	Units with mean number of courses taken in Home Economics			
	High (2.3-5.5)[a]		Low (0.3-2.2)[a]	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
1.0 - 1.9	0	0	0	0
2.0 - 2.9	4	15	3	14
3.0 - 3.9	2	8	1	5
4.0 - 4.9	7	27	5	24
5.0 - 5.9	7	27	5	24
6.0 - 6.9	5	19	4	19
7.0 - 7.9	1	4	1	5
8.0 - 8.9	0	0	2	9
Total	26	100	21	100
Means of mean differences	4.9		5.3	

P for t of difference of means of mean differences < .25 (one-tail).

Pre-test mean scores were not significantly different, but P for t < .15.

When co-variance analysis was used, F was not significant at .05.

---

[a] Divided into high and low at approximate median value.

Table 6

Number and Percentage Distribution of Units According to Mean Differences of Pre- and Post-test Scores For Lesson on Floor Facts by Units with High and Low Mean Percent Of Members with Husbands in Professional, Technical, And Kindred Types of Occupations

Mean differences between pre- and post-test scores for units	Units with mean percent of members with husbands in professional occupations			
	High (33-87)[a]		Low (0-30)[a]	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
1.0 - 1.9	0	0	0	0
2.0 - 2.9	3	13	4	17
3.0 - 3.9	2	8	1	4
4.0 - 4.9	7	29	5	22
5.0 - 5.9	6	25	6	27
6.0 - 6.9	4	17	5	22
7.0 - 7.9	1	4	1	4
8.0 - 8.9	1	4	1	4
Total	24	100	23	100
Means of mean differences	5.1		5.1	

P for t of difference of means of mean differences--identical means.

---

[a] Divided into high and low at approximate median value.

Table 7

Number and Percentage Distribution of Units According to Mean Differences of Pre- and Post-test Scores For Lesson on Floor Facts by Units with High and Low Mean Percent Of Unit Members Employed

Mean differences between pre- and post-test scores for units	Units with mean percent of unit members employed			
	High (31-62)[a]		Low (6-30)[a]	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
1.0 - 1.9	0	0	0	0
2.0 - 2.9	4	18	3	12
3.0 - 3.9	0	0	3	12
4.0 - 4.9	5	23	7	28
5.0 - 5.9	6	27	6	24
6.0 - 6.9	6	27	3	12
7.0 - 7.9	1	5	1	4
8.0 - 8.9	0	0	2	8
Total	22	100	25	100
Means of mean differences	5.1		5.1	
P for t of difference of means of mean differences--identical means.				

---

[a] Divided into high and low at approximate median value.

Table 8

Number and Percentage Distribution of Units According to Mean Differences of Pre- and Post-test Scores For Lesson on Floor Facts by Units with High and Low Mean Participation Scores

Mean differences between pre- and post-test scores for units	Units with mean participation scores			
	High (7.8-17.5)[a]		Low (3.2-7.7)[a]	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
1.0 - 1.9	0	0	0	0
2.0 - 2.9	7	30	0	0
3.0 - 3.9	1	4	2	8
4.0 - 4.9	4	18	8	34
5.0 - 5.9	6	26	6	25
6.0 - 6.9	4	18	5	21
7.0 - 7.9	0	0	2	8
8.0 - 8.9	1	4	1	4
Total	23	100	24	100
Means of mean differences	4.6		5.5	

P for t of difference of means of mean differences $< .05$ (one-tail).

---

[a] Divided into high and low at approximate median value.

Table 9

Number and Percentage Distribution of Units According to Mean Differences of Pre- and Post-test Scores For Lesson on Floor Facts by Units with High and Low Percentage Of Members in Unit in $5,000-$9,999 Income Bracket

Mean differences between pre- and post-test scores for unit	Units with percentage of members in unit in $5,000-$9,999 income bracket			
	High (73-92)[a]		Low (29-72)[a]	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
1.0 - 1.9	0	0	0	0
2.0 - 2.9	3	13	4	17
3.0 - 3.9	2	8	1	4
4.0 - 4.9	7	29	5	22
5.0 - 5.9	5	21	7	31
6.0 - 6.9	5	21	4	17
7.0 - 7.9	0	0	2	9
8.0 - 8.9	2	8	0	0
Total	24	100	23	100

Means of mean differences 5.2 5.0

P for t of difference of means of mean differences < .35 (one-tail).

Pre-test mean scores were not significantly different, but P for t was < .15 (two-tail).

When co-variance analysis was used, F was not significant at .05.

---

[a] Divided into high and low at approximate median value.

Table 10

Number and Percentage Distribution of Units According to Mean Differences of Pre- and Post-test Scores For Lesson on Floor Facts by Units with High and Low Mean Number Of Members in Unit

Mean differences between pre- and post-test scores for units	Units with mean number of members in unit			
	High (19-36)[a]		Low (8-18)[a]	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
1.0 - 1.9	0	0	0	0
2.0 - 2.9	1	4	6	25
3.0 - 3.9	3	13	0	0
4.0 - 4.9	7	31	5	21
5.0 - 5.9	8	35	4	17
6.0 - 6.9	3	13	6	25
7.0 - 7.9	1	4	1	4
8.0 - 8.9	0	0	2	8
Total	23	100	24	100
Means of mean differences	5.1		5.0	

P for t of difference of means of mean differences > .45 (one-tail).

---

[a] Divided into high and low at approximate median value.

Table 11

Number and Percentage Distribution of Units According to Mean Differences of Pre- and Post-test Scores For Lesson on Floor Facts by Units with High and Low Mean Number Of Years Unit in Existence

Mean differences between pre- and post-test scores for units	Units with mean number of years unit in existence[a]			
	High (9-40)[a]		Low (0-8)[a]	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
1.0 - 1.9	0	0	0	0
2.0 - 2.9	4	17	3	13
3.0 - 3.9	0	0	3	13
4.0 - 4.9	4	17	8	35
5.0 - 5.9	6	25	6	26
6.0 - 6.9	8	33	1	4
7.0 - 7.9	2	8	0	0
8.0 - 8.9	0	0	2	9
Total	24	100	23	100
Means of mean differences	5.3		4.8	

P for t of difference of means of mean differences < .15 (one-tail).

Pre-test mean scores were significantly different, P for t < .05 (two-tail).

When co-variance analysis was used, F was not significant at .05.

---

[a] Divided into high and low at approximate median value.

Table 12

Number and Percentage Distribution of Units According to Mean Differences of Pre- and Post-test Scores For Lesson on Floor Facts by Units with High and Low Mean Number Of Years of Membership in Units to Which Now Belong

Mean differences between pre- and post-test scores for units	Units with mean number of years of membership[a]			
	High (3.8-17.9)[a]		Low (0.0-3.7)[a]	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
1.0 - 1.9	0	0	0	0
2.0 - 2.9	6	26	1	4
3.0 - 3.9	0	0	3	13
4.0 - 4.9	2	9	10	41
5.0 - 5.9	8	35	4	17
6.0 - 6.9	4	17	5	21
7.0 - 7.9	2	9	0	0
8.0 - 8.9	1	4	1	4
Total	23	100	24	100
Means of mean differences	5.1		5.0	

P for t of difference of means of mean differences < .45 (one-tail).

---

[a] Divided into high and low at approximate median value.

Table 13

Number and Percentage Distribution of Units According to Mean Differences of Pre- and Post-test Scores For Lesson on Floor Facts by Units with High and Low Mean Number Of Different Leadership Positions Held

Mean differences between pre- and post-test scores for units	Units with mean number of different leadership positions held			
	High (2.25-4.3)[a]		Low (0.8-2.1)[a]	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
1.0 - 1.9	0	0	0	0
2.0 - 2.9	6	25	1	4
3.0 - 3.9	2	8	1	4
4.0 - 4.9	3	13	9	40
5.0 - 5.9	7	29	5	22
6.0 - 6.9	4	17	5	22
7.0 - 7.9	1	4	1	4
8.0 - 8.9	1	4	1	4
Total	24	100	23	100
Means of mean differences	4.8		5.4	

P for t of difference of means
of mean differences < .15 (one-tail).

---

[a] Divided into high and low at approximate median value.

Table 14

Number and Percentage Distribution of Units According to Mean Differences of Pre- and Post-test Scores For Lesson on Floor Facts by Units with High and Low Mean Percent Of Leadership Years

Mean differences between pre- and post-test scores for units	Units with mean percent of leadership years			
	High (53.6-102.5)[a]		Low (20.3-51.1)[a]	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
1.0 - 1.9	0	0	0	0
2.0 - 2.9	7	29	0	0
3.0 - 3.9	2	8	1	4
4.0 - 4.9	5	21	7	31
5.0 - 5.9	6	25	6	26
6.0 - 6.9	3	13	6	26
7.0 - 7.9	0	0	2	9
8.0 - 8.9	1	4	1	4
Total	24	100	23	100
Means of mean differences	4.5		5.7	

P for t of difference of means of mean differences < .005 (one-tail).

Pre-test mean scores were significantly different, P for t < .005 (two-tail).

When co-variance analysis was used, F was not significant at .05.

---

[a] Divided into high and low at approximate median value.

Table 15

Number and Percentage Distribution of Units According to Mean Differences of Pre- and Post-test Scores For Lesson on Floor Facts by Units with High and Low Mean Percent Of Meeting Time Spent on Project Lessons

Mean differences between pre- and post-test scores for units	Units with mean percent of time spent on project lessons[a]			
	High (71-100)[b]		Low (33-67)[b]	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
1.0 - 1.9	0	0	0	0
2.0 - 2.9	3	16	4	15
3.0 - 3.9	1	5	2	7
4.0 - 4.9	7	37	5	19
5.0 - 5.9	5	27	6	22
6.0 - 6.9	1	5	8	29
7.0 - 7.9	1	5	1	4
8.0 - 8.9	1	5	1	4
Total	19	100	27	100
Means of mean differences	4.9		5.2	

P for t of difference of means of mean differences < .30 (one-tail).

---

[a] No information available on one unit for time spent on project lessons.

[b] Divided into high and low at approximate median value.

Table 16

Number and Percentage Distribution of Units According to Mean Differences of Pre- and Post-test Scores For Lesson on Floor Facts by Units with High and Low Mean Scores On Reaction to Project Teaching

Mean differences between pre- and post-test scores for units	Units with mean scores on reaction to project teaching[a]			
	High (3.8-5.0)[b]		Low (1.2-3.7)[b]	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
1.0 - 1.9	0	0	0	0
2.0 - 2.9	4	18	3	13
3.0 - 3.9	2	9	0	0
4.0 - 4.9	6	27	6	26
5.0 - 5.9	6	27	6	26
6.0 - 6.9	3	14	5	22
7.0 - 7.9	1	5	1	4
8.0 - 8.9	0	0	2	9
Total	22	100	23	100
Means of mean differences	4.8		5.3	

P for t of difference of means of mean differences < .20 (one-tail).

Pre-test mean scores were not significantly different, but P for t < .15 (two-tail).

When co-variance analysis was used, F was not significant at .05.

---

[a] Two units did not provide information on reaction to project teaching as they were new units.

[b] Divided into high and low at approximate median value.

Table 17

Number and Percentage Distribution of Units According to Mean Differences of Pre- and Post-test Scores For Lesson on Floor Facts by Units with High and Low Mean Friendship Percent Scores

Mean differences between pre- and post-test scores for units	Units with mean friendship percent scores			
	High (58.7-88.9)[a]		Low (36.1-58.6)[a]	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
1.0 - 1.9	0	0	0	0
2.0 - 2.9	7	29	0	0
3.0 - 3.9	0	0	3	13
4.0 - 4.9	4	17	8	35
5.0 - 5.9	7	29	5	22
6.0 - 6.9	3	13	6	26
7.0 - 7.9	1	4	1	4
8.0 - 8.9	2	8	0	0
Total	24	100	23	100
Means of mean differences	4.9		5.2	

P for t of difference of means of mean differences < .30 (one-tail).

---

[a] Divided into high and low at approximate median value.

Table 18

Number and Percentage Distribution of Units According to Mean Differences of Pre- and Post-test Scores For Lesson on Floor Facts by Units with High and Low Mean Percent Of Unit Members Who Were Close Friends

Mean differences between pre- and post-test scores for units	Units with mean percent of members close friends			
	High (19.0-67.1)[a]		Low (7.1-18.9)[a]	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
1.0 - 1.9	0	0	0	0
2.0 - 2.9	4	17	3	13
3.0 - 3.9	1	4	2	8
4.0 - 4.9	7	31	5	21
5.0 - 5.9	5	22	7	29
6.0 - 6.9	3	13	6	25
7.0 - 7.9	1	4	1	4
8.0 - 8.9	2	9	0	0
Total	23	100	24	100
Means of mean differences	5.1		5.0	

P for t of difference of means of mean differences < .45 (one-tail).

---

[a] Divided into high and low at approximate median value.

Table 19

Number and Percentage Distribution of Units According to Mean Differences of Pre- and Post-test Scores For Lesson on Floor Facts by Units with High and Low Mean Percent Of Members Visited with One or More Times

Mean differences between pre- and post-test scores for units	Units with mean percent of members visited with one or more times			
	High (19.2-51.3)[a]		Low (7.1-19.1)[a]	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
1.0 - 1.9	0	0	0	0
2.0 - 2.9	5	21	2	9
3.0 - 3.9	1	4	2	9
4.0 - 4.9	8	33	4	17
5.0 - 5.9	5	21	7	30
6.0 - 6.9	4	17	5	22
7.0 - 7.9	0	0	2	9
8.0 - 8.9	1	4	1	4
Total	24	100	23	100
Means of mean differences	4.8		5.4	

P for t of difference of means of mean differences < .15 (one-tail).

Pre-test mean scores were significantly different, P for t < .0005 (two-tail).

When co-variance analysis was used, F was not significant at .05.

---

[a] Divided into high and low at approximate median value.

Table 20

Number and Percentage Distribution of Units According to Mean Differences of Pre- and Post-test Scores For Lesson on Floor Facts by Units with High and Low Scores On Relationship to College of Home Economics

Mean differences between pre- and post-test scores for units	Units with mean scores on relationship to College of Home Economics			
	High (6.6-8.3)[a]		Low (4.5-6.5)[a]	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
1.0 - 1.9	0	0	0	0
2.0 - 2.9	5	19	2	9
3.0 - 3.9	2	8	1	5
4.0 - 4.9	8	31	4	19
5.0 - 5.9	7	27	5	24
6.0 - 6.9	3	11	6	29
7.0 - 7.9	1	4	1	5
8.0 - 8.9	0	0	2	9
Total	26	100	21	100

Means of mean differences 4.7 5.6

P for t of difference of means of mean differences < .05 (one-tail).

Pre-test mean scores were not significantly different, but P for t < .15 (two-tail).

When co-variance analysis was used, F was not significant at .05.

---

[a] Divided into high and low at approximate median value.

END

ERIC Clearinghouse
NOV 25 1968
on Adult Education

6-18